



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Part of the permitter (cont.)

The Gemara continues its challenge to Reish Lakish's explanation of R' Meir regarding making piggul by having incorrect intent for half a permitter.

R' Yitzchok bar Avin responds to this challenge.

Rava explains, according to this explanation, the rationale behind Rabanan's position.

This explanation is rejected and Rava offers another explanation.

R' Ashi rejects this explanation and suggests an alternative explanation.

This explanation is successfully challenged.

Those who disagree with Reish Lakish and maintain that piggul could be generated by improper intent for part of a permitter are challenged.

Rabbah and Rava offer resolutions to this challenge.

### 2) The number of blood applications on Yom Kippur

A contradiction between two Baraisos is noted regarding the number of inner blood applications on Yom Kippur.

A resolution is proposed.

Another Baraisa suggests a third number of applications and the Gemara explains that Baraisa as well.

Another challenge to Reish Lakish's explanation of R' Meir is suggested and remains unresolved.

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah begins to list parts of a korban that are excluded from the prohibition of eating piggul. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is R' Eliezer's position that is relevant to our discussion?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
2. Why does R' Ashi reject Rava's explanation of the Baraisa?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
3. How many blood applications were there in the Yom Kippur service?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
4. Why does piggul not apply to a kemitzah?  
 \_\_\_\_\_

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Items which do not create a condition of piggul

ואלו דברים שאין חייבין עליהם משום פיגול

The Mishnah earlier (29b) taught the disqualification of piggul occurs when one of the four main services of an offering (slaughtering, receiving the blood, transferring the blood to the altar, and the placing of the blood on the altar) was done with intent to place the blood, offer the limbs or eat the meat beyond the time limit allotted for that offering. If the intent of piggul was committed, anyone who eats from that offering is liable for kareis. Our Mishnah presents a list of items about which a piggul intent will not cause the offering to become piggul, and one who eats from the offering after this intent was expressed would not be liable for kareis.

Among the items listed here are the kemitza, ketores (incense spices) and levona. These items and the others listed share in common that they are not things that become permitted as a result of a procedure which precedes them. The Gemara on 44a explains that the law of piggul is taught in the Torah among the laws of Shelamim (Vayikra 7:18), and this illustration establishes the Torah's guideline for piggul as something that becomes permitted to eat due to a procedure. The examples of this are meat of an offering which may be eaten, and the limbs which may be placed on the altar, each of which becomes permitted when the blood is sprinkled on the altar. The kemitza and ketores and levona do not become permitted to eat at any point, and, in fact, the kemitza itself causes the remaining flour to be eaten (מתיר).

We may ask whether the Mishnah is teaching simply that there is no kareis due to an improper intent with the kemitza and other items in the Mishnah, but the offering is still disqualified, or perhaps this improper intent does not even result in invalidating the offering.

Riv"א writes that improper intent regarding these items does not affect the offering. It remains valid and may be brought as an offering. Rash MiShantz explains that the Mishnah excludes these cases only from kareis, but the offering is no longer valid.

Rambam (Hilchos P'sulei HaMukdashim 18:3) rules that whenever an offering becomes disqualified, if someone eats from it he is in violation of the command (Devarim 14:3), "Do not eat anything which is an abomination." In Halacha 7 he writes that one who eats items

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Standing for the kevatser

ואלו דברים שאין חייבין עליהם משום פיגול... והקטורת

*These are the things for which one is not liable for piggul...and the ketores*

There is a longstanding custom to have many people carry a boy to his bris and such a person is called "kevatser". There are those who suggest that the custom is based on the desire to honor the mitzvah by having many people participate in its performance<sup>1</sup>. A variation of this approach is based on the principle (Mishlei 14:28) **ברב עם הדרת מלך** – In the multitude of the nation is the glory of the king. Having many people participate in the fulfillment of the mitzvah is not merely a means of honoring the mitzvah; rather the numerous people involved are considered participants in the fulfillment of the mitzvah<sup>2</sup>. Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach<sup>3</sup> observes that there is a practical difference between these two approaches. In order for each person to be involved in the actual performance of the mitzvah it is necessary for each participant to bring the baby closer to where the bris will take place. If, however, the multiple people involved are just a means to give honor to the mitzvah, it is sufficient to have multiple people hold the baby without even bringing the baby closer to the place of the bris.

R' Ovadiah MiBertinoro<sup>4</sup> asserts that there is a mitzvah to stand for those who do a mitzvah and for that reason the custom is to stand for those who carry a baby to his bris. Tosafos Anshei Shem<sup>5</sup> cites commentators who question the characterization of those who carry the baby to their bris

*(Insight...continued from page 1)*

such as those listed in our Mishnah is not liable for kareis, but he does get lashes.

Tosafos (23b, ד"ה הא) learns that improper intent with the items which do not become permitted by other procedures does not result in any disqualification at all. Mishneh L'Melech explains that the difference of opinion between Rambam and Tosafos can be traced back to the disagreement between Riv"א and Rash MiShantz cited above. ■

as those who are fulfilling a mitzvah. One who carries a baby to his bris is only involved in a preparation for the mitzvah but is not performing the actual mitzvah and there is no source that one should stand for someone involved in a preparatory activity of a mitzvah. Pri Etz Chaim<sup>6</sup> suggests that since Rema teaches that the sandek is equated with one who offers the ketores, it follows that one who brings the baby to his bris is participating in the mitzvah the same as one who transports the incense to the altar to be burned. In fact, Keren Orach<sup>7</sup> cites our Gemara as proof to this principle. The Gemara relates that there is no piggul liability for ketores. The fact that one could entertain the possibility of piggul regarding ketores is strange since there is no blood service. The only way that piggul could apply is while transporting the ketores to the altar. ■

1. עי' אוצר כל מנהגי ישורון תרע"ו עמ' 94.
2. עי' שו"ת משנה הלכות חייב סי' קע"ז.
3. הסכמת הגרש"י לספר אותר הברית.
4. ברטנורה למס' ביכורים פי"ג מ"ג.
5. תוסי אנשי שם שם.
6. פרי עץ חיים סוסי"י נ'.
7. קרן אורה לסוגייתינו. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The Empty Prayer

"אין בו כרת עד שיפגל בכל המתיר..."

Today's daf discusses the laws of piggul. We know that a mitzvah that is done without kavanah is like a body without a neshamah—surely an aspect of piggul, as the Tiferes Shlomo, zt"l, writes.<sup>1</sup> Yet many people have a hard time directing their thoughts. Rav Wolbe, zt"l, illustrated this failing with a true story,

"Once, a certain young man was in

the grocery, looking for various items required at home. He put aside one item after another. Strangely, just as he was reaching for the eggs, he felt a curious pain in his chest. After a moment he felt another pain and suddenly found himself...in shul davening she-moneh esrei. The pains had been nothing more than the obligatory rap on the chest during selach lanu!"<sup>2</sup>

Although prayer without kavanah is very precious since it reaches the highest heights as the Nefesh HaChaim explicitly writes, it is also an aspect of piggul, since it lacks a neshamah.

Rav Aharon of Karlin, zt"l, explains that—unlike actual piggul—such a tefillah is redeemable since it can be imbued with kavanah later. "Even when a person cannot daven with kavanah he must never refrain from davening in whatever way he can. Although for the present the tefillah without kavanah cannot ascend on high, when he will say a tefillah with kavanah he will revive all the 'empty' tefillos, enabling them to ascend on high on the 'coattails' of the prayer said with kavanah."<sup>3</sup> ■

1. תפארת שלמה, ח"א, רצ"ט
2. עלי שור
3. בית אהרן ■