

Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf
Me'ilah Daf 10

3 Iyar 5772

April 25, 2012

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of
HaRav Refoel Dov ben HaRav Yosef Yechezkel o'h.
May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his
soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of Life.

Visit us on the web at <http://www.daf-yomi.org/>,
where we are constantly updating the archives from the entire Shas.
Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler
To subscribe, please send email to: aneinu@gmail.com

Daily Daf

Mishna

A kometz (the scoopful of flour removed from the minchah by the Kohen which gets burned on the Altar), frankincense, ketores, the flour offering of Kohanim (which is completely burned), the flour offering of a Kohen Gadol (brought twice a day, half in the morning and half at night), and the flour offering of libations are subject to the laws of *me'ilah* once they are dedicated. Once they are placed into a sacred service vessel, they can now become disqualified by being touched by a *tevul yom* or a *mechusar kippurim*, and through being left overnight. One is liable (to *kares*) for *nossar* and *tumah* (if he eats it), but the law of *piggul* does not apply to it. The following is the general rule: All which have permitters (to be burned on the Altar, or for consumption), one would not be liable (to *kares*) for *piggul*, *nossar* and *tumah* (if he eats it) until their permitters have been offered; whatever has no permitters, when it has been sanctified in a sacred vessel, one would be liable (to *kares*) for *nossar* and *tumah* (if he eats it), but the law of *piggul* would not apply to it. (10a)

Permitters and non-Permitters

The Gemora cites a *braisa* which provides the Scriptural source for the Mishna's ruling (that one would be liable to *kares* for *nossar* and *tumah* – even by sacrifices which have no permitters): The *braisa* states that we may have thought that one is only liable for impurity on items that become permitted for a person or the altar, just like *piggul*. This would be logical,

since *piggul* is stricter than impurity in three ways:

1. It obligates a standard *chatas*, for rich and poor alike, while impurity obligates only a sliding scale *chatas*.
2. It only requires knowledge of the transgression afterwards to obligate a *chatas*, while impurity requires knowledge before and after the transgression to obligate its *chatas*.
3. It is never permitted, while impurity is permitted in a communal context.

Therefore, the verse says that impurity applies to “all that they sanctify for me,” including even items that do not become permitted. The *braisa* says that from this verse, we may have thought that as soon as an item is sanctified, one is liable on it for impurity. The verse therefore introduces this section by saying that if one is *yikrav* – comes close to the sanctified items. Rabbi Elozar explains that the verse goes on to punish one who is impure with *kares*, but one is never liable *kares* for just touching sanctified items. Therefore, we must read this verse to refer not to the person, but the sanctified item, limiting the punishment to items that are fit to come close, i.e., permitted for sacrifice or eating. Therefore, the *braisa* concludes that the punishment for impure contact with sanctified items begins:

1. At the point of the item becoming permitted, for items that will become permitted.
2. At the point of sanctification, for items that never become permitted.

[The Gemora in Zevachim says that we learn that *nossar* also applies to all items, due to the same word *chilul* – profaning

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, CHATAS HA'OF

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Piggul and "Permitters"

By: Daf Digest

Rashi in Zevachim explains that when we say that piggul does not apply to an item which has no permitter, this means that there is no kareis for someone who eats from an item where a piggul intent was present. This implies, however, that there still is a prohibition associated with such an item, and it would be disqualified, and one who eats from it would be liable for lashes.

Rambam concurs with this approach, as he writes (Hilchos P'sulei HaMukdashim 18:7) that one who eats a permitting item is not liable for kareis, because the law of piggul does not apply to this extent, but the intent of piggul does cause the offering to become disqualified, and one would be liable for lashes if he would eat these invalid sanctified items.

Tosafos in Zevachim (23b) writes that piggul intent has no effect upon items such as a kometz of flour, levonah or ketores, and they do not even become disqualified. Tosafos cites a Gemara (Zevachim 14a) which presents the view of R' Shimon who says that items which are offered in the Sanctuary are not eligible for piggul, because the law of piggul is written in the law of shelamim, and, as such, only applies to cases which are comparable to a shelamim. This is, in fact, the reason Chachamim exclude items which have no permitter from the law of piggul (see Zevachim 28a). There, the Gemara goes as far as to say that items which are offered in the Sanctuary do not even become disqualified if piggul intent was expressed, but the conclusion of the Gemara is that these items do become disqualified, but due to a *kal vachomer*, which is a different reason. Items where that *kal vachomer* do not apply such as those listed in our Mishnah, would remain unaffected by piggul intent, because they are not similar to shelamim in this regard.

Mishne l'Melech (to Rambam, *ibid.*) writes that we have a disagreement between Rambam and Tosafos in this regard. Rambam holds that these items become disqualified with piggul intent, and one who eats them receives lashes. Tosafos holds that piggul intent has no effect upon them, and they are not disqualified. He adds that Tosafos would hold that intent to

partake of these items outside their prescribed place also does not invalidate them, because we cannot have intent of beyond space limits be more severe than intent for eating beyond time constraints.

Keren Orah disagrees with the assessment of Mishne l'Melech. He says that Tosafos agrees that intent for piggul or for beyond the space constraints of the minchah cause the *minchah* and its kometz to be disqualified. Tosafos was only referring to the minchah of a Kohen or of nesachim, which are completely burned and have no permitter at all. These are totally unlike shelamim, and do not become disqualified with piggul intent.

DAILY MASHAL

Intentions

Rav Yerucham Levovitz, *zt"l*, imparts an important concept for understanding korbanos. "The main element of a sacrifice is the willingness with which it is brought. One's good intentions and sincere desire to do Hashem's will with the sacrifice is what determines whether the sacrifice will discharge his obligation or not." In light of this it obvious why *piggul* is completely unacceptable. Thinking that one will do the opposite of Hashem's stated instructions for the korban creates an insurmountable blemish in the sacrifice. The intentions of the one doing the avodah are the main fulfillment of Hashem's will. If they are done on condition of violating His will, this invalidates the sacrifice.

We can understand why intention is so essential in light of the following parable of the Chida, *zt"l*. A certain man attended a magnificent feast where the most expensive food was served. Two platters of the same scrumptious dish were brought before him, both steaming hot. A mouth-watering aroma wafted forth which demanded immediate attention. But when this man sampled both platters, he was astounded to find that there was a very big difference between the two. One of the dishes was spiced just right and tasted exactly as it smelled. While the second dish appeared just as savory, it had not been seasoned and tasted bland. After eating one bite, the man knew that it was not worth eating and only took from the spiced dish.

The Chida brings this example to illustrate the difference between a spiritual endeavor undertaken with the correct kavanah and another that was not. But when the person's intentions are not just "bland" but stand in contradiction to Hashem's will, it can be compared to adding a vile ingredient to an otherwise savory dish. Although it cannot be perceived by looking at it, the additive makes the food unfit for human consumption.