

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Menachos and nesachim (cont.)

A Baraisa is cited to teach that a blemished animal is called tamei.

Shmuel's earlier position that menachos and nesachim may be redeemed even while t'horim is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Pappa unsuccessfully challenges Shmuel's ruling from a Baraisa.

Different opinions are cited related to the question of whether menachos and nesachim may be redeemed while yet t'horim.

2) Piggul

R' Oshaya teaches that according to R' Shimon if one had piggul intent when offering a Mincha it is prohibited from benefit and does not transmit tum'ah as a food.

To prove his point he cites a Mishnah together with an explanation of R' Asi in the name of R' Yochanan regarding that opinion.

R' Yochanan's explanation of R' Shimon's position cited in the Mishnah is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Oshaya's original ruling is challenged from a Baraisa.

The Gemara reconciles R' Oshaya's ruling with the Baraisa.

It is noted that the reconciliation is consistent with only one version of R' Oshaya's opinion concerning the possibility of redeeming menachos and nesachim that are not tmei'im.

It is demonstrated that this explanation could be offered even according to the other version of R' Oshaya's position.

This answer is unsuccessfully challenged.

There are several unsuccessful challenges to the earlier assertion that something that at one time was permitted for consumption by performing some procedure is considered to have had a moment of fitness. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Where do we find that a blemished animal is called tamei?
.....
2. How does the Gemara respond to R' Pappa's challenge to Shmuel's ruling?
.....
3. How does R' Yochanan explain R' Shimon's position?
.....
4. Is there a difference whether blood of a korban was left out overnight before or after it was thrown on the Altar?
.....

Distinctive INSIGHT

Wood and frankincense cannot be redeemed

אלא עצים ולבונה וכלי שרת ליפרקו

The Mishnah (100b) taught that menachos or nesachim that became impure before being placed in a service vessel can be redeemed. If they had been placed in a service vessel before becoming impure, redemption is not possible.

The premise of the Mishnah is that when flour for a minchah is first designated as consecrated, this designation only applies to its value. At this point, it may be redeemed, because this level of holiness is not associated directly with the flour, but only to its value. When the flour is subsequently placed into a service vessel, its status becomes upgraded to a state of intrinsic consecration (קדושת הגוף), which cannot be redeemed. If the flour became impure before it was placed in the service vessel, the increased level of holiness fails to occur, because the service vessel cannot consecrate something which is impure. Shmuel had clarified that menachos and nesachim may be redeemed not only if they became impure, but also the redemption may be done at any point before these items are placed into the service vessels. The reason is that until the flour or wine is placed in the service vessel, the level of holiness is only monetary, and not intrinsic.

The Gemara presents a question from the Mishnah against the rule of Shmuel. The Mishnah states that birds, wood, frankincense and service vessels which become impure may not be redeemed. The case of the birds can reasonably be referring to a situation where the birds were intrinsically holy, and the rule of redeeming impure animals is not applied by birds. But, the examples of wood and frankincense which were not yet placed in a service vessel should be able to be redeemed. It must be that Shmuel's rule is not accurate, and while they are still pure they may not be redeemed although the level of holiness is only regarding their monetary value.

Shmuel answers that these items are unique, and there is a special rule that we do not allow them to be redeemed, in order to ensure that we will find items of this sort to use for the Altar's service.

We see in our Gemara that the holiness of wood, frankincense and service vessels is not intrinsic (קדושת הגוף), and the holiness is never considered more than as it applies to their monetary value. Rashi explains that this is because these items are not used directly as an offering, but they are accesso-

Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By the Geller family
In loving memory of their grandfather
ר' יהודה לייב בן ר' יהושע, ע"ה

HALACHAH Highlight

Does the prohibition against disrespecting foods apply to foods prohibited from benefit?

אוכל שאי אתה יכול להאכילו לאחרים אינו קרוי אוכל

Food that cannot be eaten by others is not considered a food

Shulchan Aruch¹ states that although there is no prohibition to destroy crumbs that are smaller than an olive's volume, nevertheless, it leads to poverty since it is disrespectful to the food. Poskim discuss whether the restriction against treating food disrespectfully applies to foods that are prohibited from benefit. Pri Megadim² writes that one may not treat disrespectfully fruits that are prohibited from benefit. Therefore, one may not throw fruits that are prohibited from benefit before a chosson and kallah if they will become soiled and ruined in the process. Rather, the prohibited fruit should be burned. The reason food may not be treated with disrespect is not that one causes it to lose value; rather disrespecting food demonstrates a lack of appreciation for what God provides and for that reason it is prohibited even if the food is prohibited from benefit. A second reason is that one who observes someone treating food prohibited from benefit disrespectfully may not realize that the food is prohibited from benefit and will think that the person lacks an appreciation for the blessings that God bestows.

Teshuvos Rav Pealim³ disagrees and maintains that the

(Insight...continued from page 1)

ries which enable an offering to be brought.

Rabeinu Gershom explains that these items do not have intrinsic holiness "so much," because they are not brought for their own sake, but only as accessories to facilitate other offerings. It seems from Rabeinu Gershom that these items have an intrinsic holiness, but that it is not so complete as we find with other such items. ■

prohibition against acting disrespectfully to food does not apply to food that is prohibited from benefit. Teshuvos Binyan Tzion⁴ also maintains this position and cites our Gemara to prove that position correct. R' Shimon asserts that food that is prohibited from benefit is not susceptible to tum'ah. The basis of this conclusion is that the verse states (Vayikra 11:34), "and from all the food that you eat." This implies that food that could be eaten even by others is considered a food but food that is not eaten by others is not called a food. According to this approach it is obvious that once it is not considered a food the prohibition against disrespecting a food does not apply. Furthermore, it is likely that Tanna Kamma disagrees with R' Shimon only with regards to the question of tum'ah of foods but would agree regarding the prohibition against disrespecting a food that it does not apply to food that is prohibited from benefit. ■

1. שו"ע או"ח סי' קי"ב סעי' ד'.

2. פמ"ג סי' קע"א א"י סק"א.

3. שו"ת רב פעלים ח"ג או"ח סי' ט'.

4. שו"ת בנין ציון ח"ג לשו"ע סי' קי"ב סעי' ד'. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Directing the Heart to Heaven

שאם מצא אחרת נאה הימנה מצוה לפדותה

People go out of their way to procure the best esrog they can, and the custom all over is to compare esrogim. On the first day of Sukkos everyone shows his esrog to his friends, each one vying to be, if not the best, then as close as possible.

The Mishnas Sechir, zt"l, mentions this custom and points out that he never understood it. "This appeared to be a purposeless custom. I was even unsure whether it amounted to mere arrogance. Why else should such comparison be done in public? I was also uncertain whether this was at least inappropriate

levity."

But later he found a source for this custom. "We find in Menachos 110 that it is the same whether one does much or little as long as his heart is directed toward heaven. But Menachos 101 and Shevuos 15 seem to contradict this. There we find that if one finds a superior red cow he should redeem the inferior parah and purchase the better one. Tosafos in Shevuos asks about this contradiction and explains that one who brings a 'greater' offering should not feel pride since the small offering can be just as desirable as long as the one who gave it had his heart directed toward heaven.

"In Yoma 70 we find that after the kohen gadol read the Torah on Yom Kippur people would bring in their sifrei Torah to show to the assembled multitudes. Rashi explain that this was to

show the pleasantness of the Torah. As the verse states, 'זה קלי ואנוהו'. I believe they did this for the sake of heaven to show how much money they spent on mitzvos. Since they spent so much money on mitzvos this shows that they ask for parnasah to do the will of God. Prayers offered with this intention will be accepted and one's livelihood will be doubled, as we find in Sefer Chassidim."

He concluded, "Since nowadays few people own a sefer Torah, the custom is to publicly show one's esrogim on the first day of Sukkos. Through this one shows that his intention in asking for livelihood is for Hashem and his earnings will be doubled. 'The customs of Yisrael are Torah!'" ■

1. ס' ל"א

2. מובא בספר דף על הדף על מסכת מנחות,

דף ק"א ■