



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Causing a Mincha to leaven (cont.)

The assertion that one is liable on Shabbos for merely placing meat on coals is successfully challenged.

2) Placing meat on coals

Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan rules that one who places meat on coals and turns it over is liable but if he does not turn it over he is exempt.

The Gemara searches for the exact circumstances of this case.

Rava asserts that the roasting must occur in a single place.

This assertion is challenged and an alternative explanation of the Mishnah is given.

A second version of this conversation is recorded.

3) Processing a leavened mincha

A Baraisa discusses the source for the prohibition against processing a leavened mincha.

Two related inquiries are presented and left unresolved.

Since it turns out that the phrase **אשר תקריבו** is unaccounted for, a Baraisa is cited that expounds this phrase.

One of the opinions cited in the Baraisa is challenged and then clarified.

The other opinion in the Baraisa is explained.

A consistency between two statements of R' Yochanan is noted.

Once the Gemara cites the Baraisa that contains R' Yoshia's opinion the Gemara proceeds to analyze the dispute between R' Yoshia and R' Yonasan.

A detail of R' Yochanan's earlier statement is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Akiva's earlier-cited opinion is unsuccessfully chal-

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

*Is the kometz allowed to become chametz on top of the Altar?
 חימצה בראשו של מזבח מהו?*

The Gemara presents several inquiries regarding the prohibition not to allow a minchah to become chametz. Rav Mari asks what the halacha would be regarding a case where the kometz was allowed to become chametz only after it was placed on top of the Altar to be burned. One possibility is that the prohibition might only be in effect (Vayikra 2:11) "אשר תקריבו—that it shall be offered," and when this kometz was placed upon the Altar to be burned it was still matzah. Or, perhaps the verse is teaching that the kometz may not be chametz the entire time it is being offered, until it is actually burned in the fire. If this were true, it would not be permitted to allow it to become chametz even after it is placed upon the Altar. This question is left unresolved.

It is noteworthy that according to the first approach, the word **תקריבו** only dictates that the kometz must be matzah until it is placed on top of the Altar, but not necessarily until it is burned. According to Rashi, this refers to a case where the kometz was placed on top of the Altar, but not on the fire. Sfas Emes is puzzled by this comment, because if it has not yet been placed on the fire, how could the Gemara consider this to be a fulfillment of **תקריבו**, of being offered? The procedure of the kometz is not simply to be put on the Altar, but to be burned there, and until that point it is clearly not considered "offered."

The Gri"z explains that the Gemara's inquiry is regarding the case where the kometz was eventually actually burned on the fire. This is where the Gemara considers its initial placement on the top of the Altar as the beginning of its being burned. However, if the kometz did not eventually get burned, it is clear that we would not refer to its placement on the Altar as the beginning of a fulfillment of "תקטירו", and its becoming chametz at that time would be a violation of the prohibition.

The Gri"z also determines that Rashi would hold that once the kometz is placed on the fire, even if the fire has not enveloped the kometz, the application of the prohibition of allowing it to become chametz has elapsed. Tosafos (ד"ה אשר) says that mere placement of the kometz on the fire is not enough to fulfill the law of burning it, but the fire must fully take hold and envelop the kometz.

Keren Orah explains that even if we say that the prohibition not to allow the kometz to become chametz is not applicable once it has been placed on top of the Altar, and one would not be liable for lashes for allowing this process, it would still, nevertheless, be prohibited to burn this leavened kometz on the fire of the Altar. The verse (Vayikra 2:11) states that any leavened product may not be brought on the Altar. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. How much of a food must reach the stage of **מאכל בן דרוסאי** for one to be liable?

2. What lessons are derived from the phrase **אשר תקריבו לה**?

3. What is the point of dispute between R' Yoshia and R' Yonasan?

4. Explain **כל שהוא ממנו לאישים הרי הוא בכל תקטירו**.

HALACHAH Highlight

Can dough become chometz after the surface has crusted?

ושמענא ליה לר' עקיבא דאמר מדת יבש לא נתקדשה

And we have heard that according to R' Akiva a measure designated for solids is not sanctified

A Baraisa presents R' Akiva's position that the lechem hapanim could potentially become chometz and for that reason the Torah commands one to take precautions that it should not become chometz. The Gemara asks that the flour for the lechem hapanim is measured in a measuring utensil used for dry ingredients and R' Akiva maintains that those measuring utensils are not sanctified to be able to sanctify their contents. Therefore, it is only when the loaves are placed on the Shulchan that they become sanctified, but at that point the loaves are already baked and cannot at that point become chometz. Tosafos¹ suggests that even according to R' Akiva it is possible for the lechem hapanim to become chometz. There are opinions which maintain that an oven sanctifies loaves from the time that the surface crusts. Perhaps R' Akiva subscribes to that opinion and maintains that from the time the surface crusts it is sanctified but it may also become chometz during that time. It must be, concludes Tosafos, that once the surface crusts it can no longer become chometz. This conclusion has impact as far as the halachos of making matzah for Pesach are concerned. The stage of the surface crusting is defined by Tosafos² as the

(Insight...continued from page 1)

lenged.

4) Offering non-sacrificial parts

A Baraisa discusses the prohibition against offering non-sacrificial objects on the Altar.

The Baraisa's reference to the two loaves and the lechem hapanim is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Yochanan and R' Elazar dispute whether there is liability for offering non-sacrificial parts on the ramp.

The basis of their dispute is explained. ■

stage at which one could break the matzah without there being stands of dough connecting the two pieces.

Shulchan Aruch³ rules that if matzah was baked to the degree that one could break the matzah without strands of dough pulling from both sides it may be used for the mitzvah at the seder. Rema⁴ adds that one should be careful not to remove the matzah before it reached this stage and then return it to the oven a second time since it could become chometz during the time that it is out of the oven. Be'ur Halacha⁵ proves from Tosafos in our Gemara that one must be concerned even בדיעבד that it became chometz if it was removed from the oven before the stage of its surface crusting. ■

1. תוס' ד"ה ושמעין.

2. תוס' לקמן ע"ח: ד"ה פורסה.

3. שו"ע או"ח סי' תס"א סעי' ג'.

4. רמ"א שם.

5. ביאור הלכה שם ד"ה ויש להזהר. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Convalescence and Full Recovery

"לרבות לחם הפנים לחימוץ..."

The Avnei Nezer, zt"l, provides a deep explanation of a statement found on today's daf. "The Zohar explains why we absolutely refrain from chometz on Pesach, yet we specifically bring an offering of chometz on Shavuos. This can be understood with a parable of a king whose only son was very sick. The doctors said that the king's son should eat a healing diet to help him recover. But when the son became well again, there was no need for him to confine himself to eating according to such a restricted plan."

The Avnei Nezer explained, "The same is true regarding chometz. On Pesach we are ill and must eat matzah to heal us. But after the splitting of the sea, we are no longer vulnerable to chometz and can now bring it up on the altar. We can understand this in view of the words of the Ramban in Devarim 29:17. As is well known, chometz is likened to the yetzer hara. On Pesach we are likened to an ill person who cannot absorb foods that are difficult to digest. By Shavuos we are so completely recovered that we can serve Hashem with our yetzer hara.

"In light of this we understand why the Lechem HaPanim—which was set up on Shabbos—must be matzah and may not be chametz. Although Shabbos is higher than Shavuos, it has a dual pur-

pose. It is the pinnacle of the week that passed. But it is also the source of the blessings for the week to come, as we find in the Zohar. The showbread is set up on Shabbos to stay until the next week and is the source of material bounty for the next week, as the Ramban writes in Parshas Terumah. Clearly, this does not allude to the first aspect of completion of the week gone by. Lechem HaPanim, in its bearing of the blessing of the coming week, must be matzah to signify that it represents a new beginning which has not yet come to culmination. Shavuos is the culmination of Pesach and the Sefirah. Since it alludes to completion, we bring the offering of the two breads specifically from chometz."¹ ■

1. נאות הדשא, ח"א, ע"י צ"ב ■