



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

### Menachos Daf Chuf Hey

#### MISHNA

- If the kometz became tamei (making it passul to be offered) and the Kohen still offered it, the tzitz makes it accepted as a valid korbon. If the kometz was taken out of the Azarah (making it passul to be offered) and the Kohen still offered it, the tzitz does not make it accepted as a valid korbon. The reason for this distinction is that the tzitz brings acceptance for the psul of tamei, but not for the psul of yotzeh.

#### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "v'nasa Aharon es avon hakodashim". Which aveira is referred to in the pasuk which teaches that the tzitz renders a passul korbon valid? It can't refer to piggul, because the pasuk regarding piggul says "lo yeichashev", which teaches that it is absolutely passul. It also can't refer to nossar, because the pasuk regarding nossar says "lo yeiratzeh", which teaches that it is absolutely passul. Rather, it must be referring to the psul of tumah, which we find is lenient in that it is waived for a korbon tzibbur.
  - **Q: R' Zeira** asked, maybe it refers to the psul of yotzeh, which we find is lenient in that it is waived for a korbon brought on a bamah? **A: Abaye** said, the pasuk regarding the tzitz says "lifnei Hashem", which teaches that it brings acceptance for a psul that is done in the Mikdash.
  - **Q: R' Illa'ah** asked, maybe it refers to the psul of an avodah done with the left hand, which we find is lenient in that it is mutar during the Avodos of Yom Kippur? **A: Abaye** said, the pasuk refers to the psul as an "avon" (a sin), and the Avodah using the left hand on Yom Kippur is the proper way to do that Avodah, and certainly not a sin. **A2: R' Ashi** said, the pasuk says that the tzitz brings acceptance for the "avon hakodashim" (the sin of the korbanos), which suggests that it is not referring to a psul of the Kohen (which is what using the left hand would be).
  - **Q: R' Sima the son of R' Idi** said to **R' Ashi**, maybe it refers to the psul of baal mum, which we find is lenient in that it is not a psul for bird korbanos? **A: R' Ashi** said, the pesukim regarding a baal mum say "lo yeiratzeh" and "ki lo l'ratzon yihiyeh lachem", which teach that there can be no acceptance for them.
- A Braisa says, if blood became tamei and was then offered on the Mizbe'ach, if it was done b'shogeg, the korbon is accepted. If it was done b'mezid, the korbon is not accepted. This is for individual korbanos. With regard to korbanos of the tzibbur it is accepted whether it was done b'shogeg or b'mezid. With regard to the korbanos of goyim, whether it was done b'shogeg or b'mezid it is not accepted.
  - **Q:** This seems to contradict another Braisa that says that the tzitz brings acceptance for the blood, meat, or cheilev of a korbon that became tamei and was offered, whether b'shogeg, b'mezid, b'oneis, or willingly, whether it is the korbon of an individual or of the tzibbur!? **A: R' Yosef** said, this second Braisa follows the view of **R' Yose**, whereas the first Braisa follows the view of the **Rabanan**, from a Braisa. The Braisa says, one may not separate terumah from tamei produce for produce that is tahor. If it was separated, then if it was done b'shogeg it is a valid separation of terumah, but if it was done b'mezid it is not. **R' Yose** says, whether it was done b'shogeg or b'mezid it is a valid separation of terumah. We see that the **Rabanan** differentiate between shogeg and mezid, whereas **R' Yose** does not.
    - **Q:** From this Braisa we only find that **R' Yose** does not penalize one for doing an act b'mezid. It doesn't show that he holds that the tzitz would bring acceptance for the meat that is eaten!? In fact, a Braisa says that **R' Yose** argues on **R'**

**Eliezer** and holds that the tzitz does *not* bring acceptance for meat that is eaten!? **A:** We must reverse the views of this Braisa so that it is **R' Eliezer** who says that the tzitz does *not* bring acceptance for meat that is eaten.

- **Q: R' Sheishes** asked, how can you reverse the views? Another Braisa, which says that the tzitz brings acceptance for the parts of the korbon that are eaten, also says that the zrika is not effective for a korbon that has left the Azarah. Now this (that the zrika is not effective for a korbon that has left the Azarah) is the view of **R' Eliezer**, which means that the Braisa is his view, which also means that his view is that the tzitz brings acceptance for the parts of the korbon that are eaten!? **A:** Rather, **R' Chisda** said, the second Braisa follows the view of **R' Eliezer**, whereas the first Braisa follows the view of the **Rabanan**.
  - **Q:** We only find that **R' Eliezer** holds that the tzitz brings acceptance for the parts that are eaten. We don't find that he holds that he does not penalize one for acting b'meidid!? **A:** We don't find that, because regarding terumah he said that the tamei terumah that was separated is a valid separation of terumah, whether it was done b'shogeg or b'meidid.
  - **Q:** Maybe **R' Eliezer** only holds that way and doesn't penalize regarding terumah, which is lenient, but would not hold that way regarding kodashim, which is more stringent!? **A:** If this is true, whose view would the Braisa follow? It must be that he does not differentiate between terumah and kodashim.
- **Ravina** said, the first Braisa is discussing the zrika, and regarding that there is a difference between shogeg and meizid. The second Braisa is discussing the way in which the korbon became tamei, and regarding that there is no difference between shogeg and meizid.
- **R' Shila** said, the first Braisa is discussing the way in which the korbon became tamei, and regarding that there is a difference between shogeg and meizid. The second Braisa is discussing the zrika, and regarding that there is no difference between shogeg and meizid.
  - **Q:** The second Braisa does not seem to be discussing the zrika at all!? **A:** We can explain the Braisa as referring to the zrika.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, if blood became tamei and was then used for zrika, if it was done b'shogeg it is accepted, but if it was done b'meidid it is not accepted. This refutes what **R' Shila** said!? **A:** The Braisa should be understood as saying, if blood became tamei and was then used for zrika – whether the zrika was done b'shogeg or b'meidid – the halacha is, if it became tamei b'shogeg it is accepted, but if it became tamei b'meidid it is not accepted.