



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

Menachos Daf Chuf Vuv

MISHNA

- If the shirayim became tamei, burned, or lost before the kometz was offered, according to **R' Eliezer** the mincha is valid and the kometz may be offered, and according to **R' Yehoshua** the mincha is passul and the kometz may not be offered.

GEMARA

- **Rav** said, **R' Yehoshua** only holds this way if *all* of the shirayim became tamei, but if only some of it became tamei the mincha would not become passul.
 - **Q:** The Gemara understands the statement of **Rav** as only referring to the case of the shirayim becoming tamei (as he explicitly says), but not the case of the shirayim becoming burned or lost. This would mean that he says that if even part of the shirayim were burned or lost **R' Yehoshua** would hold that the mincha is passul. What does **Rav** hold? If he holds that the remaining shirayim is considered significant (which is why, when there is some remainder that is not tamei it remains valid) then why is the case different when only part of the shirayim was burned or lost? If he holds that the remaining part of the shirayim is not significant, then even when only part became tamei the reason it is valid is because the tzitz brings acceptance, if so, even if the *entire* shirayim became tamei we should say that it is valid based on the tzitz!? **A: Rav** holds that the remaining shirayim is considered significant and therefore, even in the case of where part of the shirayim was burned or lost **R' Yehoshua** would hold that the mincha is valid. The reason he only mentions the case of tamei is because that is the first case mentioned in the Mishna, but he certainly means to include all three cases.
 - We can see this from a Braisa as well. The Braisa says, **R' Yehoshua** says, all korbanos of the Torah that were shechted and the meat or cheilev were destroyed or became tamei, as long as there is at least a kezayis that remains, we may do a zrika and the korbon is valid. However, a half kezayis of each will not combine to allow offering of the blood. If the korbon is an Olah, it will combine (since both are to be burned on the Mizbe'ach). One does not offer the blood based on having some of the accompanying mincha still intact.
 - **Q:** A mincha has no blood, so how is it part of this discussion? **A: R' Pappa** explained, this refers to the mincha that accompanies an animal korbon. We would think that since it is brought with the korbon, the blood of the korbon can be offered if the mincha is intact even if the meat and cheilev are no longer intact. The Braisa therefore teaches that the blood may only be offered if there is some meat or cheilev.
 - **Q:** How do we know that even if the meat is lost but there is cheilev in existence, that the zrika may be done? **A: R' Yochanan in the name of R' Yishmael** said, the pasuk says that a zrika should be done and then says "v'hiktir hacheilev l'reyach nicho'ach laHashem". This teaches that even if there is only cheilev, a zrika is done.
 - **Q:** How do we know that if only the diaphragm and the kidneys remain, a zrika may be done? When the Braisa says that a zrika may not be done on the basis of the mincha, it suggests that it may be done on the basis of the diaphragm and the kidneys, so how do we know this? **A: R' Yochanan** said, the words "l'reyach nicho'ach" teach that anything that is put on the Mizbe'ach for this purpose (of l'reyach nicho'ach) can serve as the basis for the zrika.

- If we would only have the word “cheilev” we would think that the diaphragm and kidneys cannot serve as the basis for the zrika. If we only had the “l’reyach nicho’ach” we would think that even a mincha can serve as the basis.

MISHNA

- If the kometz was not put into a kli shareis, it is passul. **R’ Shimon** says it would be valid.
- If the kometz was burned in two parts (instead of all at once), it is valid.

GEMARA

- **R’ Yehuda the son of R’ Chiya** said, the view of **R’ Shimon** is based on the pasuk of “kachatas ka’asham”, which teaches that if the Kohen does the kemitza by hand, it should be done with the right hand like a chatas, and if it is done with a keili, it should be with the left hand like an asham. **R’ Yannai** said, once the kemitza was done from a kli shareis, the kometz may even be brought up and burned using his shirt or a regular earthenware pot. **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, all agree that the kometz must be placed into a kli shareis. The machlokes is where the avodos that follow that were done without the keili.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that a kometz that is offered, whether by hand or in a keili, and whether with the right hand or the left, is valid. This must follow **R’ Shimon**, and we see that he does not require using the right hand even when a keili is not used. This refutes **R’ Yehuda the son of R’ Chiya!**? **A: R’ Yehuda the son of R’ Chiya** would say, the Braisa is discussing each thing separately and should be understood as saying – if it is done by hand, the right hand must be used, but if it is done with a keili, either hand may be used.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R’ Shimon** says the mincha is valid even if the kometz was put into a keili that is not a kli shareis. This refutes **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak!**? **A:** The Braisa means that he holds it is valid when the avodos *following* the placement of the kometz in a kli shareis are done even in a regular keili. However, the kometz must first be made kodesh by putting it in a kli shareis.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R’ Shimon** holds, as long as the kometz was taken from a kli shareis, he may even bring it up to the Mizbe’ach and offer it without the need for another kli shareis. This refutes **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak**, because it seems that **R’ Shimon** does not require that the kometz be made kodesh in a kli shareis!? **A:** The Braisa means to say that “as long as the kometz was taken from a kli shareis *and made kodesh in a kli shareis*, he may even bring it up to the Mizbe’ach and offer it without the need for another kli shareis”.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if the Kohen did the kemitza with his right hand and then put the kometz into his left hand, he should put it back into his right hand. If it was in his left hand and he had an intent for beyond its place or time, it becomes passul but does not have a chiyuv kares. If he had the intent while it was in his right hand, then if it was intent for beyond its place it becomes passul with no kares, but if the intent was for beyond its time it becomes passul with a chiyuv kares. This is the view of **R’ Elazar and R’ Shimon**. The **Chachomim** say, that once the kometz is put into his left hand it becomes passul to be offered. The reason is that it must be made kadosh in a keili, but once it is put in his left hand it is like the blood from an animal going from the neck onto the floor and then gathered back up, which makes the korbon passul. Now, the Braisa implies that **R’ Elazar and R’ Shimon** hold that the kometz does not need to be put into a keili to be made kadosh. This refutes **R’ Nachman!** **TEYUFTA.**
 - **Q:** The Braisa supports **R’ Yehuda the son of R’ Chiya**, who says that **R’ Shimon** says that when done by hand the avodah must be done with the right hand. Should we say that it refutes **R’ Yannai**, who seems to say that **R’ Shimon** would even allow the left hand? **A: R’ Yannai** would say, I hold like the Braisa regarding the burning of the cheilev, which said that **R’ Shimon** holds that the avodah can even be done with the left hand, and would not explain the Braisa differently (as we did above).

HIKTIR KUMTZA PAMAYIM KISHEIRA

- **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** said, this suggests that it is valid if done in two parts, but not if done in more than two parts. **R’ Yochanan** said, even in many parts it would be valid.

- **Q:** What is the machlokes between them? **A:** **R' Zeira** said, the machlokes is whether there is a kometz less than 2 zeysim and whether there can be a burning of less than a kezayis. **R' Yehoshua** holds that there is not and **R' Yochanan** holds that there is.
- With regard to the kometz, at what point does it allow the shirayim to be eaten? **R' Chanina** said, when the fire catches onto it, and **R' Yochanan** said, when the fire takes hold of most of it.
 - **Q:** **Ravin bar R' Ada** told **Rava**, your talmidim said in the name of **R' Amram** that a Braisa learns from a pasuk that a kometz can even be put onto the fire even up to a moment before sunset. Now, at that point the fire will not take hold of most of it before sunset and yet the Braisa says it is valid. This refutes **R' Yochanan!**? **A:** The Braisa is referring to when it is permitted to put the kometz on the Mizbe'ach. **R' Yochanan** is referring to when the shirayim become mutar. **A2:** **R' Elazar** said, that the Braisa is referring to putting the kometz on *after* sunset, and it is referring to pieces of the kometz that burst off the fire and have to be put back on. **R' Dimi in the name of R' Yannai** said this as well.
- **R' Assi** said, when **R' Elazar** was learning Menachos he asked, what is the halacha if the Kohen put the kometz on the Mizbe'ach and then put the wood on top of it? Is that a normal manner of burning or not? The Gemara leaves with a **TEIKU**.
 - **Chizkiya** asked, what is the halacha if the Kohen put the limbs of a korbon on the Mizbe'ach and then put the wood on top of it? The pasuk says "ahl ha'eitzim" and therefore the limbs must be on top of the wood, or maybe the pasuk of "asher tochal ha'eish es ha'olah ahl haMizbe'ach" teaches that either way is fine? The Gemara leaves with a **TEIKU**.
 - **R' Yitzchak Nafcha** asked, what is the halacha if the limbs are placed near the side of the fire instead of on top of it? Do we say that "ahl" means on top, or can we say that since other times "ahl" can mean "next to" over here it does as well? Or maybe just as "ahl haMizbe'ach" means on top of the Mizbe'ach, "ahl" regarding the fire means on top of the fire as well? The Gemara leaves with a **TEIKU**.