



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Menachos Daf Vuv

- The Gemara continues its discussion of the Braisa.
 - **R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said, the Braisa means that the kal v'chomer can be refuted by saying that we can learn that a treifa is a valid korban from a mah hatzad from cheilev, blood, and melika. When you say that melika is different because the thing that makes it kadosh also makes it assur, we will say that cheilev and blood are not like that and yet they are mutar for the Mizbe'ach. When you say that cheilev and blood are different because they come from a valid animal, we will say that a bird killed with melika is a bird that is entirely assur and is still mutar for the Mizbe'ach. We will go back and forth with the result that there is a tzad hashava that these things are assur for an individual and yet are mutar for the Mizbe'ach. We can also say that a treifa animal should be part of this group, and although it is assur for an individual it should be mutar for the Mizbe'ach. That is why we need a pasuk to teach that it is not.
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid tzad hashava, because cheilev, blood, and melika are different than treifah, because that is the only way to fulfil their mitzvah.
 - **R' Ashi** said, the Braisa means that the kal v'chomer can be refuted by saying that the logic of the kal v'chomer is flawed from the very beginning. The kal v'chomer was based on the fact that an animal that is a baal mum is mutar for an individual but is assur for the Mizbe'ach. We can say that the reason it is assur for the Mizbe'ach is because the Torah required the korban to be like the Kohen doing the Avodah – just as a Kohen with a mum is not valid to do the Avodah, so too an animal with a mum is not valid for a korban. However, a Kohen who is a treifa is valid to do the Avodah, and therefore it may be that an animal that is a treifa is mutar for the Mizbe'ach. That is why we need a pasuk to teach that an animal that is a treifa is passul for the Mizbe'ach.
 - **Q: R' Acha Saba** said to **R' Ashi**, the case of the animal born with a Caesarean Section disproves this theory, because a Kohen born in that way is mutar to do the Avodah, and yet an animal born in that way is passul for the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** We can say that such an animal is different since it can't get the kedusha of being a bechor, but a treifa can, and maybe that is why it can be a valid korban.
 - **Q:** The case of an animal that is a baal mum shows this is not correct, because it can get the kedusha of being a bechor and yet it cannot be brought as a valid korban!? **A:** We can say that a baal mum is passul because it is like the Kohen who is doing the Avodah (who is passul if he has a mum). We will then say that the case of an animal born via Caesarean Section shows that this is not true. We will go back and forth and come out with a tzad hashava that they are mutar for individuals and yet passul for a korban, and can say that a treifa, which is assur for individuals, should *certainly* be passul for a korban. If so, why is the pasuk needed!?
 - The Gemara says, the reason treifa could not be included with the others is that the issur of treifa has exceptions to its rule.
 - **Q:** What are the exceptions? If it is the case of a bird korban being killed with melika, we can say that baal mum has the same exception, because a bird with a mum may be offered as a korban! It also can't be from the fact that a chatas bird killed with melika may be eaten by the Kohanim, because they are considered to

be eating from Hashem's food, and it is not considered to be a heter for an individual! **A:** Rather, the reason why treifa could not be included with the others is that the others are recognizable characteristics (a mum can be seen and a Caesarean Section birth is something that is heard about), but a treifa is not seen by people and therefore we would think that it could be brought as a korbon. That is why we need the pasuk to teach that it is passul to be brought as a korbon.

- **Q:** The Braisa says that "min habakar" comes to exclude the bringing of a treifa as a korbon. We should learn that a treifa is passul from the pasuk of "mimashkei Yisrael", which we darshen to teach that a korbon may only be brought from something that is mutar for a Yid to eat!? Also, we can learn this from the pasuk of "mikol asher yaavor tachas hashavet", which can teach that a treifa, which is not healthy, cannot be brought as a korbon!? **A:** If we only had the pasuk of "mimashkei Yisrael" we would think that only a treifa that never had a period of validity is passul. If we had "kol asher yaavor" we would think that it is only passul if it was made kadosh when it was already a treifa, but if it became a treifa after that we would say it may be brought. The pasuk of "min habakar" therefore teaches that it is passul even in this case.

MISHNA

- Whether it is a chatas mincha or any other mincha, whose kemitza was done by a non-Kohen, an onein, a tvul yom, a Kohen who wasn't wearing all the bigdei Kehuna, a mechusar kippurim, one who didn't wash his hands and feet, a Kohen without a bris, a tamei, a Kohen who was sitting, or who was standing on a keili, or on an animal, or on someone else's feet, the kemitza is passul.
 - If the kemitza was done with the left hand it is passul. **Ben Beseira** says, he should put the kometz back into the keili and take a new kometz with his right hand.
 - If the kemitza was done and there was a pebble mixed in with the flour, or there was a grain of salt, or a piece of levonah, it is passul. The reason is, that they said that a kometz that has too much or too little is passul. The case of too much is where he heaped the flour in his hand. The case of too little is where he did the kemitza with his fingertips.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why does the Mishna say, "Whether it is a chatas mincha or any other mincha"? Why not simply say "any mincha..."? **A:** This is needed according to **R' Shimon** of a Braisa who says that the Torah did not want the chatas mincha to be an elegant korbon and that is why it is brought without oil and levonah, and the Torah did not want the animal chatas to be an elegant korbon and that is why it is brought without nesachim. Based on this, we would think that for this same reason, if it is brought by one of these people it would still be valid, albeit not elegant. The Mishna is therefore teaching that even the chatas mincha becomes passul.
 - **Q:** If so, in the Mishna that discusses all the pesulim of our Mishna, but speaks of animal korbanos (in Mesechta Zevachim) the Mishna should also begin by saying, "Whether it is a chatas or any other type of korbon..." and we should say that it needed to say this according to **R' Shimon**!? Yet that Mishna only says "all korbanos"!? **A:** Our Mishna is different, because we already established that the previous Mishna in our Mesechta does not follow **R' Shimon**, so we would say that this Mishna also doesn't follow **R' Shimon**. That is why we have to show that it does.
- **Rav** said, if a non-Kohen did a kemitza, he should put the flour back into the keili and a kemitza can then be done by a valid Kohen.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna said that a kemitza done by a non-Kohen will make the mincha passul!? **A:** The Mishna means it is passul until it is put back into the keili and a new kemitza is done.
 - **Q:** If that is what the **T"K** means, he is saying the same thing as **Ben Beseira**!? **A:** In a case where the kemitza that was taken is still in existence and can be returned all would agree that it can be put back into the keili and a new kemitza can then be done. The machlokes is where the kemitza that was taken by the

non-Kohen is no longer in existence and can't be returned. The **Rabanan** (the **T"K**) hold that he can't replace that flour with flour from somewhere else and therefore the mincha is passul, and **Ben Beseira** holds that he can replace it with other flour and it therefore remains valid.

- **Q:** If this is the only case in which they argue, the Mishna should say that **Ben Beseira** says that he can refill the flour from elsewhere and then do another kemitza. Why does the Mishna say that **Ben Beseira** says he should simply do another kemitza? **A:** **Rav's** statement was made according to the view of **Ben Besiera** (and would not follow the **Rabanan**).
- **Q:** According to **Ben Beseira** it is obvious that the kemitza should be put back and taken again!? **A:** We would have thought that **Ben Beseira** only allows that to be done when the kemitza was passul for being done with the left hand, but for other kinds of pessulim he would not allow it to be put back and taken again. **Rav** therefore teaches that **Ben Beseira** holds this way for a kemitza done by a non-Kohen as well.
- **Q:** Why would we think that the kemitza done with the left hand should be treated differently? If it is because we find that an Avodah can be done with the left hand on Yom Kippur, we should say the same thing for an Avodah done by a non-Kohen since the shechita of a korbon may be done by a non-Kohen!? **A:** Shechita is not considered to be an avodah.
- **Q:** **R' Zeira** said that the shechita of the parah adumah would be passul if done by a non-Kohen, and **Rav** explained, this is because the pasuk says "chukah" and "Elazar". We see that **Rav** holds that shechita *is* an avodah!? **A:** The parah adumah is only kadshei bedek habayis. Therefore, its processes are not classified as Avodos.
 - **Q:** If the shechita of an actual korbon is allowed by a non-Kohen, surely the shechita of a parah adumah, which is only kadshei bedek habayis, should be valid if done by a non-Kohen!? **A:** **R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said, we find things that are not Avodos that require a Kohen, such as the determination of nega'im.
- **Q:** Why can't we learn from the Avodah done on a bamah, where the Avodah of a non-Kohen is valid? If you will try and say that we don't learn the procedure of the Mizbe'ach from that of a bamah, I will tell you that a Braisa says that we do, because the Braisa says that if a korbon leaves the Azarah and is then brought back in and up onto the Mizbe'ach we do not take it down. We learn this from a bamah, where such a korbon may be offered! **A:** The Braisa actually bases that halacha on the pasuk of "zos Toras ha'olah", not on a comparison to a bamah, because such a comparison is actually not made.
- **Q:** We are saying that if not for **Rav** we would have thought that the leniency of **Ben Beseira** only applies to when the kemitza is done with the left hand, but not when it is done by one of the other pessulim listed in the Mishna. However, there are two Braisos which imply that **Ben Beseira** would say this leniency even for the other pessulim as well!? **A:** Rather, what **Rav** is teaching is that **Ben Beseira** holds that even if the passul person took the kemitza and already made it kadosh by putting it into a kli shareis, he can still put it back into the keili with the rest of the flour and make another, valid kemitza. This is different than the views of **R' Yose ben Yasyan and R' Yehuda Hanachtom** in a Braisa which explain **Ben Beseira's** leniency as being limited to before the kometz was made kadosh in a kli shareis.
 - **Others** say that **Rav** meant to limit **Ben Beseira's** leniency to where the kometz was not yet placed into a kli shareis to be made kodesh. According to this version, **Rav** is agreeing with the views of **R' Yose ben Yasyan and R' Yehuda Hanachtom** of the Braisa.