

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The tzitz and tum'ah (cont.)

Another unsuccessful challenge is recorded to R' Shila's resolution of the contradictory Beraisos regarding the question of whether the tzitz is effective for deliberate tum'ah.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents a dispute about what happens if the leftovers become disqualified or lost before the kometz is burned.

3) Clarifying R' Yehoshua's position

Rav asserts that R' Yehoshua's position that the korban is disqualified is limited to where all the leftovers became tmei'im.

The Gemara clarifies that although Rav only mentioned tum'ah he meant the other disqualifications listed in the Mishnah as well.

The last point of the Baraisa that was cited is clarified.

The source that the blood of a korban may be applied as long as some of the meat is intact is identified.

A second source that the blood may be thrown if the diaphragm and kidneys are intact is sought.

The reason two expositions are necessary is explained.

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses a kometz that was not placed in a sacred utensil and one who burns the kometz in two stages.

5) Clarifying R' Shimon's position

R' Yehudah the son of R' Chiya offers an explanation for R' Shimon's position that a kometz is valid even if it is not placed in a sacred utensil.

R' Yannai suggests another rationale for R' Shimon's position.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok offers a third explanation.

R' Yehudah the son of R' Chiya's explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

Numerous unsuccessful attempts to refute R' Nachman bar Yitzchok's explanation are recorded until the Gemara finally

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

Improper intent with the kometz in the kohen's left hand

בשמאלו וחישב עליה בין חוץ למקומו וכו'

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said that both opinions in the Mishnah, Tanna Kamma and R' Shimon, agree that the kometz must be consecrated by being placed into a service vessel (כלי שרת). The view of R' Shimon in the Mishnah which validates the service of the kometz without a service vessel is only after it has been consecrated properly. R' Shimon says that, for example, the kometz may be taken out of the service vessel and placed by hand upon the Altar to be burned.

The Gemara brings a Baraisa which challenges the explanation of R' Nachman bar Yitzchak. It teaches that if the kometz was taken from the minchah with the kohen's right hand, and placed into the kohen's left hand, it must be returned to the kohen's right hand before any service may be done. Any improper intent expressed while the kometz is in the kohen's left hand may render the minchah to be invalid, but one who eats from it would not be liable for kareis. If the kohen returns the kometz to his right hand, then improper intent may render it invalid and result in kareis as well. This is the view of R' Elazar and R' Shimon. Chachamim hold that as soon as the kometz is taken into the kohen's right hand, it is irreparably disqualified from being offered. The Gemara notes that it is the Chachamim who hold that the kometz is no longer valid by being taken into the left hand, because they say that it must be placed directly into a service vessel. However, R' Shimon who says that being placed in the left hand does not ruin it must say that the kometz does not need to be consecrated by being placed into a service vessel. The Gemara concludes that this is a refutation against R' Nachman's contention that all opinions, including that of R' Shimon, hold that the kometz has to at least initially be placed into a service vessel.

Rashi explains that the Baraisa was discussing where the kometz was taken with the right hand, and then placed in the kohen's left hand. While walking the kometz to the Altar, the kohen expressed a piggul intent. The minchah became invalid, but not to the extent of kareis. Shitta Mikubetzes questions this, on the grounds that an improper intent while walking, הולכה, should not have any effect, because R' Shimon is the one who holds that הולכה is not a point when piggul can occur, as הולכה itself may be dispensed with (see Zevachim 13a).

Shitta Mikubetzes explains that the case is where the kohen took the kemitzah with his left hand, and he then expressed an improper intent of piggul. As far as piggul is concerned, the minchah is kosher, because piggul only applies when all other aspects of the offering are valid, but here, the kometz was removed with the kohen's left hand. The minchah is not valid, however, because the kemitzah was done with the left hand. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua?

2. What is the point of dispute between Tanna Kamma and R' Shimon?

3. At what point do the leftovers become permitted for consumption?

4. What question would R' Elazar ask when studying Menachos?

HALACHAH Highlight

Is it necessary for the sacred utensil to sanctify the kometz?

שלא בכלי שרת

If the Mincha was not placed in a sacred utensil

Teshuvus Emek Halacha¹ raises the question of whether it is necessary for the sacred utensil of the Beis HaMikdash to sanctify the Mincha. Before addressing that question he establishes that it is essential that the Mincha is placed into a sacred utensil. This is based on the Gemara's exposition that just as an Olah requires a utensil, i.e. a slaughtering knife, so too all other korbanos require a utensil. For the Mincha this means that it is necessary for the Mincha to be placed in a sacred utensil of the Beis HaMikdash. He then notes that Tiferes Yisroel² asserts that the requirement to place the Mincha in a sacred utensil is only *l'chatchila*. Emek Halacha, however, cites Rashi to our Gemara that demonstrates that it is essential to put the *kometz* in a sacred utensil. The Mishnah presents a disagreement whether putting the *kometz* in a utensil is essential. Rashi³ explains that the discussion in the Mishnah relates to the second utensil into which the *kometz* is placed because the requirement to put the Mincha in the first sacred utensil is not subject to debate. From this it is evident that placing the Mincha in a sacred utensil is not merely *l'chatchila*; rather it is essential.

This exposition, however, only establishes an obligation for the *kometz* to be placed in a sacred utensil but it does not address the question of whether that utensil must sanctify the *kometz* as well. He further qualifies the question by noting another related dispute. There is a dispute whether sanctification of the Mincha requires intent. If the sanctification does not require intent the question will never arise since the Mincha must be placed in a sacred utensil and it automatically becomes sanctified. The question is relevant according to the opinion that this sanctification

succeeds at refuting this explanation.

It is noted that this last Baraisa supports R' Yehudah the son of R' Chiya and wonders whether it refutes R' Yannai.

R' Yannai explains how this Baraisa does not refute his explanation.

6) Dividing the kometz

R' Yehoshua ben Levi and R' Yochanan disagree whether the *kometz* is valid if it is divided more than two times.

The point of dispute between them is identified.

7) Permitting the leftovers for consumption

R' Chanina and R' Yochanan disagree when the *kometz* permits the leftovers for consumption.

R' Yehudah suggests a source for R' Yochanan's position.

R' Yochanan's position that the leftovers become permitted when the fire has ignited most of it is unsuccessfully challenged.

8) The manner of burning

R' Assi asks whether it is an acceptable manner of burning to place the wood on the *kometz* and this inquiry is left unresolved.

Chizkiyah asked a similar question regarding the limbs of a korban and that inquiry was also left unresolved.

R' Yitzchok Nafcha asked whether it is acceptable to put the limbs of a korban next to the pyre. ■

requires intent. What will be the halacha if the Mincha is placed in a sacred utensil without intent to sanctify it? Is the sanctification essential for the Mincha or not? He ultimately proves that sanctification of the Mincha is an essential part of placing the Mincha in the sacred utensil and if this sanctification does not occur the Mincha is invalid. ■

1. שו"ת עמק הלכה ח"א סי' מ"ו.
2. תפארת ישראל מסכת מעילה פ"ב.
3. רש"י ד"ה שלא בכלי שרת. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Chasam Sofer's Unusual Custom

"אברים ופדרים שמעלן ומקטירן מבא השמם ומתעכלין והולכין כל הלילה..."

Although the Rama rules that one should dip the bread that is broken at the start of every meal in salt, many people are only careful about this on Shabbos. The Chasam Sofer, zt"l, was careful to dip the bread in salt during every meal except Friday night. On leil Shabbos he had salt on the table but did not dip his challah in it at all.

When asked why he explained that the

basis for this unusual minhag was a halachah brought on today's daf. "In Menachos 26 we find that in the Beis HaMikdash limbs and fats which are normally offered at night may be brought on the altar all night long. They used salt at night, giving us a reason to salt our bread which is compared to a sacrifice. But on Friday night, they never put limbs or fats on the altar, so why should we dip our bread in salt?"¹

But the work Minhag Yisrael Torah defends the prevalent minhag to dip challah in salt even on Friday night. "The reason why salt is relevant even on Friday night is that there were limbs and chelev

that were placed on the altar on Friday before sunset. Since these were salted, there is no reason not to dip bread in salt even on Friday night."

Interestingly the Kol Bo rules that we do not say *והוא רחום* on Friday night for a similar reason. "We say *והוא רחום* due to the late-afternoon tamid offering which atoned for the sins throughout the day. Because the limbs and fats of this sacrifice were brought on the altar throughout the night, we mention that the Merciful One atones. But on Friday night, they did not put the limbs and fats on the altar—it is fitting that we do not say this prayer."² ■

1. מנהגי החת"ס, פ"ה, אות י"ב
2. מובא במג"א, סי' רס"ז, ס"ק א' בשם ב"י