



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

Menachos Daf Chuf Daled

- When **R' Kahana** went to EY he met the sons of **R' Chiya** who asked, what is the halacha if someone splits the flour of a mincha into two and puts it into a bowl in a way that the two halves are not touching, and a tvul yom then touched one of the halves? When a Mishna says that a keili combines what is in it with regard to kodesh, is that only when the items in the keili are touching each other or is it even if they are not touching each other? **R' Kahana** told them, the Mishna's verbiage of "a keili combines" suggests that the keili combines them even if they are not touching.
 - **Q:** They then asked him, what if someone took a third half from another mincha and put it in between the two halves in the bowl and a tvul yom touched that new half, would that make the other two halves passul as well? **A: R' Kahana** said, a keili only combines things that need to be in that keili. This flour from the other mincha does not need to be in the keili along with the first mincha, and therefore it is not considered to be combined along with the two halves of the first mincha.
 - **Q:** They then asked, what if the tvul yom sticks his finger into the airspace between the two halves? Would it make the two halves tamei? **A:** He answered, the only thing that can become tamei through airspace is an earthenware keili.
 - **Q: R' Kahana** then asked them, can one take a kemitza from one half for the other? Is the rule that the keili combines them a halacha D'Oraisa or D'Rabanan? **A:** They said, we have not learned this exact case, but we have learned the halacha in a similar case. The Mishna says that if two menachos became mixed, but it is possible to take a kemitza from each separately, they are valid. Now, presumably the case is that there is a section where the menachos are mixed, and then an unattached piece of each mincha that is not mixed, and from which a kemitza can be taken. If so, we see that even though it is not touching the rest of its own mincha (the part that is mixed with the other mincha) it is still a valid kemitza for it!
 - **Rava** said this is not a valid proof, because the case of the Mishna may be where the part of each mincha that was not mixed with the other mincha was attached to the part of the mincha that is mixed with the other mincha. That may be the reason that a kemitza can be taken for it.
 - **Q:** Where do we come out on this question? **A: Rava** said, a Braisa says, the pasuk says "v'heirim mimenu", which teaches that the kometz must be taken from flour attached to the mincha, meaning that he should not bring the mincha separated into two keilim and then take a kometz from one for the other. Now, this implies that if the two halves were in one keili, similar to being in two keilim (they were separated apart in one keili), he would be able to take a kemitza from one for the other!
 - **Abaye** said this is not a valid proof. The case of the two keilim may be that a smaller keili was placed into a larger keili and the flour overflowed from the smaller into the larger, but since the wall of the keili acts as a barrier through the airspace of the outer keili they are not considered to be connected even though they touch up above the airspace of the keili. The case of the one keili that is similar to two keilim would be a keili that has low dividers within it which don't reach the height of the walls of the keili. In that case, since the flour touches above these dividers, still within the airspace of the keili, they are considered connected. However, in our case the two halves are not

touching at all, and so we have the question as to what the halacha will be.

- **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, if the two halves of a mincha are separated in a keili, and one of those halves is attached to a third half (of another mincha) by water, and the half not connected with water becomes tamei (thereby making the second half in the keili tamei because they are combined in one keili), does the third half outside the keili become tamei as well? Do we say that when the Mishna says that items in a keili are considered as combined for kodesh that is only for matters inside the keili, but not for things outside the keili, or do we say that once it is considered to be combined, it is considered to be fully combined for all matters? If you will say that once it is considered to be combined, it is considered to be fully combined for all matters, what if the outside half became tamei, making the half connected to it by water tamei as well, would the other half in the keili become tamei? Do we say that the keili only combines where the source of tumah is inside the keili, but not when it comes from outside, or do we say there is no difference? **TEIKU**.
- **Q: Rava** asked, what if the mincha was divided and one of the halves became tamei and the two halves were then put into a keili, and a tvul yom then touched the tamei one, will the other become tamei? Do we say that that half is already fully tamei and the touching of the tvul yom therefore doesn't effect it at all (and it therefore won't spread to the other half), or not? **A: Abaye** said, we see from a Mishna that **R' Yose** holds that a sheet that become tamei medras (a severe tumah from a zav laying on it) can still become tamei from the touching of a zav (which is only relevant if the tumas medras is later removed), and we don't say that the sheet was already fully tamei and can't accept more tumah!
 - **Rava** said, **R' Yose** may be talking about where the sheet was *first* touched by a zav and *then* became tamei medras. Since tumas medras is so severe, it can take effect on the sheet that was already tamei from the touching of a zav. However, the reverse may not be true.
 - **Q: Abaye** said, we can bring a proof from the later part of the Mishna, which says that **R' Yose** agrees that if there are two sheets folded on top of each other and a zav sits on them, the upper one is tamei medras and the lower one is tamei medras and tamei from touching a zav. We see that we don't say that it is fully tamei and can't accept more tumah!? **A: Rava** said, this case is different, because both tumos came at the same time. The case of the mincha was where one tumah came later on.
- **Rava** said, if a person divided a mincha and lost one of the halves, then designated a new half to take its place, and then found the lost half, and now all three halves are in one keili, the halacha is that if the lost one becomes tamei, the other original half becomes tamei as well, but the replacement does not. If the replacement became tamei, the original half that was not lost also becomes tamei, but the lost half does not. If the original half that was not lost becomes tamei, the lost half and the replacement also become tamei as well. **Abaye** said, even if the lost one or the replacement become tamei, all the others become tamei as well. The reason is that all 3 are "members of the same house" (they are of the same mincha).
 - **Rava** said that the same is regarding the kemitza. If the kometz was taken from the lost one, its shirayim and the shirayim of the other original half may be eaten, but the shirayim of the replacement may not be eaten. If the kometz was taken from the replacement, its shirayim and the shirayim of the original half that was not lost may be eaten, but the shirayim of the half that was lost may not be eaten. If the kometz was taken from the half that was not lost, neither the shirayim of the lost one or the replacement may be eaten. **Abaye** said, even if the kometz was from the lost one or the replacement none of the others may be eaten. The reason is that all 3 are "members of the same house" (they are of the same mincha).
 - **Q: R' Pappa** asked, can the shirayim of the one from which the kometz was taken be eaten? Part of the kometz was taken for the third half, which is passul, which makes the kometz passul, which should therefore

not allow the shirayim to be eaten!? **R' Yitzchak the son of R' Mesharshiya** asked, how can the kometz be offered? The part of the kometz that is taken for the third half is in essence chullin!? **A: R' Ashi** said, the kometz is dependent on the intent of the Kohen, and we can assume that he only had in mind for two halves, not three (since that would make it passul). Our only question is to which other half he had intent, and that is why we can't eat the other halves.