



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **MISHNAH (cont.):** The Mishnah continues to list items excluded from the piggul prohibition and a related disagreement between R' Shimon and R' Meir. The Mishnah concludes with a discussion of things that become permitted through other things.

2) Piggul intent for a kemitza

Ulla makes a statement about a kemitza that is piggul but the statement is not clear.

A possible explanation of Ulla's statement is suggested.

The Gemara challenges what seems to be the novelty of this ruling since this novelty has been taught elsewhere.

Another novelty of his teaching is suggested.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Achai applies Ulla's teaching to another case.

3) Invalid offerings placed on the altar

R' Yitzchok in the name of R' Yochanan teaches that piggul, nosar and tamei lose their prohibition when placed on the altar.

A number of unsuccessful challenges to this ruling are presented.

4) The meaning of the phrase **וטומאתו עליו**

A Baraisa is cited that has four proofs that the phrase **וטומאתו עליו** refers to where the person was tamei rather than the korban.

Rava elaborates on Rabbi's proof that **וטומאתו עליו** refers to where the person was tamei.

Since Rava mentioned that Baraisos that are not explained by Zeiri are lacking explanation the Gemara cites a Baraisa and begins to search for its meaning as an example of a Baraisa that is only fully understood with Zeiri's explanation. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between R' Shimon and R' Meir?

2. How does the Gemara initially understand Ulla's statement?

3. When does the altar purify invalid korbanos?

4. According to Rava, whose commentary is essential?

Distinctive INSIGHT

The kometz that is consumed by the fire of the altar

לא צריכא שמשלה בהן האור

If a kohen separated the kometz from a mincha with the intent that he was going to eat from it beyond its time frame, the mincha becomes piggul. Ulla taught that if, nevertheless, the kohen later places that kometz on the altar, the restricted condition of piggul is released. The basis for his contention is that the kohen's act of taking the small amount of the kometz with piggul intent has the power to confer a status of piggul to the other parts of the mincha. This condition of piggul is not finalized until all the other critical elements of the mincha are performed properly. Thus, the very burning of the kometz on the altar finalizes the piggul condition. If, however, the burning of the kometz from this mincha is not valid due to the kometz being piggul, its being burned cannot accomplish anything. It must be, therefore, that the piggul condition is not a factor in the burning of the kometz itself.

The Gemara notes that there does not seem to be any novelty in this statement of Ulla, as we already know that an item placed on the altar may remain there even if it had become disqualified due to its being designated to be brought after its time limit (**אם עלו לא ירדו**). And we also know that Ulla's point could not be that once it has been placed on the altar, if it was subsequently removed then it may be replaced upon the altar, because this is not the halacha. Rather, the Gemara determines that the point of Ulla is that the issue of piggul is released after the kometz is placed upon the altar and then mostly consumed by fire. After it is consumed by fire it may indeed be replaced upon the fire if it becomes removed.

The Gri"z notes that the assumption of the Gemara prior to this explanation must be understood. The reasoning for Ulla was that it must be that the piggul status is released from the kometz as it completes the mincha procedure and a status of piggul is conferred upon the rest of the mincha. Yet, the kometz only achieves this stage when it is burned, and not when it is simply placed upon the altar.

Mikdash Dovid points out that on our daf, R' Yitzchok states that placement upon the altar and being consumed by fire not only alleviates a condition of piggul, but it also releases other disqualifications such tum'ah and נותר. Yet, the Gemara in Menachos (25a) rules that if a

HALACHAH Highlight

Insects found in flour

אבל קומץ דמיפרת אימא לא

But the kometz which is comprised of separate pieces, I might think this law does not apply

When the Torah issues the prohibition against eating insects it adds the phrase על הארץ – on the land. Chazal understand that this phrase teaches that only those insects that crawled on the ground are prohibited but those insects that never left the fruit in which they were formed are not prohibited. This principle is codified in Shulchan Aruch¹ as well. Based on this principle, Poskim debate the status of insects that are found in flour. There are three opinions regarding their status. Chochmas Adam² adopts the most stringent approach. He maintains that each piece of flour is separate from the next so as the insect crawls around in the container of flour it is considered as though it left its “fruit” of origin and moved to another fruit. Shach³ and Taz⁴ hold that the flour is considered one unit and the insect is not prohibited until it leaves the flour and walks along the walls of the utensil. Pri Chadash⁵ maintains that as long as the insect has not yet left the container it is still considered to be in its original environment and thus permitted. It is only when the insect exits the utensil altogether that it becomes prohibited.

(Insight...continued from page 1)

kometz was taken out of the courtyard and later placed upon the altar, it does not atone. Why, though, does atonement not happen? Once the kometz is burned, the issue of being brought out of the courtyard should be released, as R' Yitzchok says.

He answers that once the fire begins to take hold, the kometz becomes depleted. Atonement cannot be procured once the kometz is no longer completely intact. ■

Darchei Teshuvah⁶ suggests that our Gemara is a proof to Shach and Taz's position. The Gemara initially thinks that when the fire takes control of part of the kemitzah it is not considered as though it has taken control over the entire kemitzah since each piece is considered an independent entity from the next. The Gemara's conclusion is that once the fire takes hold of part of the kemitzah it is considered as though it has taken control over the entire quantity. Based on the Gemara's conclusion one could argue that flour is also considered a single unit and insects found anywhere in the flour are permitted because it is not considered as though they have left their place of origin. ■

1. שו"ע יו"ד סי' פ"ד סעי' א'.
2. חכ"א כלל ל"ח סעי' י"א.
3. ש"ך שם ס"יק ט"ו.
4. ט"ז שם סק"ז.
5. פרי חדש שם ס"יק י"ז.
6. דרכי תשובה שם סק"ס. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Burning Flame

”שמשלה בהן האור...”

During the third meal of Shabbos, the Beis Yisrael of Gur, זת"ל, was known to deliver very inspiring Torah that was strong enough to fire his chasidim for at least the coming week. One week he gave a lesson from a statement on today's daf. “On Zevachim 43 Rav Yitzchak teaches that piggul, nosar or tamei which was brought up on the altar has its prohibition removed from it. Rav Chisda makes an oath and bemusedly wonders, ‘How can the altar remove issurim?’ Rav Zeira explains

that it is discussing a case where the various offerings actually caught fire.

“This teaches us a very important lesson in avodas Hashem,” the rebbe enthusiastically exclaimed. “When one is filled with holy fervor, all inner evils that are like piggul, nosar, and tumah, fall away. All the filth and dirt is removed.”¹

We can understand this in light of a parable brought in the Toras Avos: “Once there was a man who owned a huge forest. Since developing the area was the best way to earn money from his land, he decided to remove the trees. To this end, the owner began to cut down the forest tree by tree. After many long days, he noticed that he was hardly making any progress. If he did

not manage to increase his efficiency, it was quite plausible that the trees would grow back before he had a chance to cut down the rest. What did he do? He set fire to the forest and within a short time he achieved his goal.

“The same is true in spiritual terms. One who fights day in and day out against each illicit thought and spiritual challenge eventually realizes that he must find a better method to overcome his base nature. He will only prevail if he ignites a holy fire in his heart. As long as he is on fire with longing for Hashem, he will soon incinerate every base thought and failing.”² ■

1. פאר ישראל, ח"א, ע' רפ"ב
2. תורת אבות, דרכים בעבודת ה', ע' קל"ח