



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Zevachim, Daf ק"י – Daf כ"ק

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

#### -----Daf ק"י---118-----

- The Gemara had quoted a Braisa that said that **R' Shimon** said that even the tzibbur did not bring obligatory korbanos on the bamah of the tzibbur, except for the Korbon Pesach and other korbanos that have a fixed time in which to be brought. The Gemara says, **R' Shimon's** view is based on the pasuk of "vayaasu Bnei Yisrael es hapesach baGilgal". This seems to be obvious. We must say that the pasuk is coming to teach that obligatory korbanos like the Pesach were brought on the bamah of the tzibbur, but korbanos that are different, in that they don't have a fixed time associated with them, were not brought on the bamah of the tzibbur. The view that argues on **R' Shimon** uses this pasuk for the drasha of **R' Yochanan in the name of R' Bena'ah**, who says that the pasuk teaches that a person who is tamei meis and also doesn't have a bris milah can still become tahor through the sprinkling of the parah adumah.
  - A Braisa was taught in front of **R' Ada bar Ahava** that said, there is no difference between the large (community) "bamah" and the small (private) "bamah" except that the Korbon Pesach and other obligatory korbanos that have a set time may only be brought on the large bamah. **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, the "obligatory korbon" referred to in the Braisa is an obligatory olah, which may be brought since there is a corresponding olas nedavah (and the Braisa seems to imply that the obligatory korbon that may be brought is one that has a corresponding donative version). However, it cannot refer to a chatas, because there is no such thing as a donative chatas.
    - **Q:** Maybe say that it refers to an obligatory mincha, since there is an obligatory mincha of the Kohen Gadol that was brought on the large bamah? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** holds that a mincha is not brought on the small bamah.

#### BA'U L'SHILOH...

- **Q:** How do we know that the Mishkan in Shiloh was built of stone with a material roof? **A: R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, one pasuk refers to the Mishkan of Shiloh as a "house" and other pesukim refer to it as a "tent". To reconcile these pesukim we learn that the structure was built with stone but the roof was made of material.

#### KODSHEI KODASHIM

- **Q:** How do we know that kodashim kalim could be eaten anywhere within sight of Shiloh? **A: R' Elazar in the name of R' Oshaya** said, the pasuk speaking of Shiloh warns against bringing a korbon in a place that can see the Mishkan. From this we learn that it is assur to *bring* a korbon if the Mishkan can only be seen from there, but it is mutar to *eat* a korbon in such a place.
  - **Q:** Maybe we should learn from the pasuk that a korbon can't be *brought* in such a place, but it may be *shechted* in such a place? **A: R' Yannai** said, the pasuk says "sham taaleh...v'sham taaseh" which makes a hekesh between bringing and shechting, and teaches that just as the korbon must be brought up in the Azarah, so too it must be shechted in the Azarah.
  - **R' Avdimi bar Chasa** said, the pasuk refers to Shiloh as "Tanas Shiloh", which refers to the fact that after its destruction people who saw it would sigh in remembering that this place was special in that kodshei kalim could be eaten anywhere within sight.
  - **R' Avahu** said, the pasuk says "bein porus Yosef bein porus alei ayin". This is in reference to Shiloh and teaches that it allowed kodshei kalim to be eaten anywhere within sight of it.
  - **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said, the pasuk of "uritzon shocni sineh" teaches that when the Mishkan was in Shiloh one could eat kodshei kalim even when he was in the territory of another Shevet (as long as he could see it).
  - A Braisa says, when they said that kodashim kalim may be eaten anywhere from where one can see the Mishkan Shiloh, it means from someplace that Shiloh can be seen without anything blocking in between.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Shimon ben Elyakim** told **R' Elazar** that an example of such a place is the Beis Hakneses of Maon.
- **R' Pappa** said, when they said that kodashim kalim may be eaten anywhere from where one can see the Mishkan Shiloh, it means from someplace that one can even see only part of it.
  - **Q: R' Pappa** asked, what if it is a place that one could see it when standing, but not when sitting? **R' Yirmiya** asked, what if there is a river bank from which one can see it, but if he goes into the river he cannot see it? The Gemara remains with a **TEIKU**.
- **R' Dimi in the name of Rebbi** said, there are four places where the Shechina rested on the Yidden – Shiloh, Nov, Givon, and in the Beis Hamikdash. In all of these places the Shechina always rested in the portion of Binyamin, as the pasuk regarding Binyamin says “chofeif alav kol hayom”. When **Abaye** repeated this to **R' Yosef**, **R' Yosef** said that is not right, because the pasuk says that when Hashem left Shiloh, He abandoned Yosef and Efraim, which means that Shiloh was in the portion of Efraim!
  - **Q: R' Ada** said, this pasuk is not difficult. It may be that the Shechina was in the portion of Binyamin but the Sanhedrin were located in the portion of Efraim, and that is what the pasuk referred to when it says that Efraim was abandoned. In fact, we find this arrangement (that the Shechina is in the portion of one Shevet and the Sanhedrin is in the portion of another Shevet) by the Beis Hamikdash, where the Shechina was in the portion of Binayamin and the Sanhedrin were in the portion of Yehuda!? **A:** In the Beis Hamikdash that was possible, because the portions of Binyamin and Yehuda were adjacent to each other. However, Shiloh was not adjacent to Binyamin, so the Shechina could not have been in the portion of Binayamin.
    - The Gemara says, it is possible that the Shechina at Shiloh rested in the portion of Binyamin and the Sanhedrin was in the portion of Efraim, and this was achieved because a small strip of land went from Efraim into Binyamin and it was on that land that the Sanhedrin sat. We find this concept by the Beis Hamikdash, where we are taught that there was a small strip of land of Yehuda that went into Binyamin and it was on that land that the Mizbe'ach stood.
    - We find that there is a machlokes between Tanna'im whether Shiloh was in the portion of Binyamin or in the portion of Efraim/Yosef.
- A Braisa says, the Mishkan in the Midbar lasted for 39 years. The Mishkan in Gilgal lasted 14 years – 7 during the years of conquering and 7 during the years of dividing the land. The Mishkan in Nov and Givon lasted 57 years. That left 369 years that the Mishkan in Shiloh stood.
  - We know that the Mishkan in the Midbar lasted 39 years, because the pasuk says that it was put up in the second year of being in the Midbar, and we were in the Midbar for 40 years.
  - We know that the Mishkan in Gilgal lasted 14 years, because we learn from the pasuk telling us of Kalev's age after the conquering of the land that the conquering lasted for 7 years. Once we know that the conquering took 7 years we can assume that the dividing took just as long. We also know this from a pasuk which can only be explained if we say that the conquering and dividing took a total of 14 years.
  - We know that the Mishkan in Nov and Givon lasted 57 years from the pasuk which teaches that it stood there from when the Aron was returned after being captured, until the Beis Hamikdash was built. From other pesukim we can figure out that this was 57 years.

-----Daf ט"ט---119-----

BA'U L'NOV V'GIVON...

- **Q:** How do we know that when they came to Nov and Givon it again became mutar to bring korbanos on bamos? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk says “ki lo vasem ahd atah ehl hamenucha v'ehl hanachalah” – “ehl hamenucha” refers to Shiloh and “ehl hanachalah” refers to Yerushalayim. The pasuk mentions each one separately in order to teach that between the times of Shiloh and Yerushalayim, bamos would be mutar.
- **Q: Reish Lakish** asked **R' Yochanan** why doesn't the Mishna mention that maaser sheini had to be brought to Nov and Givon to be eaten? **A: R' Yochanan** said, there is a gezeira shava between maaser sheini and the Aron on the word “sham”, which teaches that since there was no Aron in Nov and Givon, maaser sheini was not required to be eaten there.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Reish Lakish** asked, if so, then the Pesach and other kodashim shouldn't have had to be eaten there either, because the pasuk of "sham" discusses these also and they are therefore part of the same gezeira shava! **A: R' Yochanan** said, the Mishna that implies that maaser sheini could have been eaten anywhere follows the view of **R' Shimon**, who says that even the tzibbur only brought the Pesach and other obligatory korbanos that have a fixed time to be brought, but did not bring other obligatory korbanos at that time. Therefore, animal maaser was not brought there. The pasuk makes a hekesh from animal maaser to maaser sheini, which teaches that just as animal maaser is not brought to Nov and Givon, so too maaser sheini need not be eaten there.
  - **Q: Does this mean that according to R' Yehuda**, who says that obligatory korbanos were brought at Nov and Givon, maaser sheini had to be eaten there as well? **A: Yes**, and in fact **R' Ada bar Masna** explicitly says that **R' Yehuda** holds that way.
    - **Q: The eating of maaser sheini is required to be done "lifnei Hashem"**, and since there was no Aron there, how could that have been called "lifnei Hashem"? **A: We have learned that R' Yosef** taught a Braisa which says, that according to **R' Yehuda** Nov and Givon were considered as "lifnei Hashem" for purposes of maaser sheini.

### BA'U L'YERUSHALAYIM...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "ki lo vasem ahd atah ehl hamenucha v'ehl hanachalah" – **R' Yehuda** says that "menucha" refers to Shiloh and "nachalah" refers to Yerushalayim and he brings other pesukim to prove his view, and **R' Shimon** says that "menucha" refers to Yerushalayim and "nachalah" refers to Shiloh and he brings other pesukim to prove his view.
  - **Q: According to R' Yehuda** the pasuk is written in chronological order, and therefore makes sense. According to **R' Shimon** the pasuk should have written nachalah before menucha! **A: The pasuk is saying**, that during the times of Gilgal, not only have you not come to Yerushalayim, you have not even come to Shiloh (because obligatory korbanos could not be offered).
  - The yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** taught a Braisa that both refer to Shiloh. **R' Shimon ben Yochai** says that both refer to Yerushalayim.
    - **Q: According to the previous Tanna'im** who say that menucha refers to one place and nachalah to another place it makes sense that the pasuk says "ehl hamenucha v'ehl hanachalah". However, according to the Tanna'im who say it refers to the same place, the pasuk should have just said "ehl hamenucha v'hanachalah"! The Gemara remains with a KASHYEH.
    - **Q: It makes sense to say that both words refer to Shiloh**, because it was a "menuchah" in that it was built after the war to conquer the land and was a "nachalah" in that the land was divided there. However, if it refers to Yerushalayim, it makes sense that it is called a nachalah, but why would it be referred to as menucha? **A: It is because it was the resting place of the Aron.**
    - **Q: According to the view that both refer to Yerushalayim**, that would mean that bamos were mutar during the time of Shiloh, and that is why the pasuk says that Manoach offered a korbon on a bamah. However, according to the view that both refer to Shiloh, that means that bamos were assur during the time of Shiloh. If so, how did Manoach offer a korbon on a bamah!? **A: It was a "hora'as sha'ah"** for him to do so.
    - The Yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** taught a Braisa that said like **R' Shimon ben Yochai**, that both refer to Yerushalayim.

### KOL HAKODASHIM...

- The Mishna said that there is only kares when an animal was made kodesh during a time that bamos are assur and that korbon is then shechted outside. However, if it was made kodesh at a time when bamos were mutar and was then shechted outside during a time when bamos were assur, there would not be kares. **R' Kahana** said, this differentiation is only for the shechting of the korbon, but for offering up the korbon outside, there would even be kares in this second case. This is learned from the pasuk that says "va'aleyhem tomar", which we read as if it were written with an "ayin" and therefore means "and on the previous written concept you should say...", which teaches that there is kares even in that case.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Rabbah** asked, the word is written with an “aleph” not an “ayin”!? Also, **R’ Shimon** clearly says in a Braisa that if the animal was made kadosh at a time when bamos were mutar and was then shechted and offered up at a time when bamos were assur there is no kares!? **TEYUFTA** of **R’ Kahana**!

V’EILU KODASHIM...

- The reason that korbanos brought on a private bamah are patur from:
  - Semicha – is because the pasuk says “lifnei Hashem v’samach”
  - Shechita in the north – the pasuk says “tzafona lifnei Hashem”
  - Blood applications all around the Mizbe’ach – the pasuk regarding that says “asher pesach Ohel Moed”
  - Tenufa – the pasuk says “v’heinif haKohen lifnei Hashem”
  - Hagasha – the pasuk says “v’higisha ehl haMizbe’ach”

R’ YEHUDA OMER EIN MINCHA B’BAMAH

- **R’ Sheishes** said, according to the view that a mincha could be brought on a bamah, a bird korbon could also be brought on a bamah, and according to the view that a mincha could not be brought on a bamah, a bird korbon could also not be brought on a bamah. This is because the drasha of the word “zevachim” would teach that it must be an animal, but cannot be a mincha or a bird.
- The reason that korbanos brought on a private bamah are patur from:
  - A Kohen having to do the Avodah – the pasuk says “v’zarak HaKohen...asher pesach Ohel Moed”
  - Bigdei Kehuna – the pasuk says “l’shareis baKodesh”
  - Klei Shareis – the pasuk says “asher yisharsu bam baKodesh”
  - Reyach Nicho’ach – the pasuk says “Pesach Ohel Moed...l’reyach nicho’ach LaHashem”
  - A line dividing the upper part of the Mizbeach from the lower – the pasuk says “v’huysa hareshes ahd chatzi haMizbe’ach”
  - Washing of the hands and feet – the pasuk says “uvikarvasam ehl haMizbe’ach yirchatzu”
- **Rami bar Chama** said, the bamah is only patur from needing the dividing line when it is a korbon of a private bamah that is offered on a private bamah. However, if the korbon of a private bamah is offered on the bamah of the tzibbur, there would be a requirement to have the line.
  - **Q: Rabbah** asked, a Braisa says that there is no tenufa requirement for the korbon of a private bamah, even if it is offered on the bamah of the tzibbur. Presumably the same should be true for the requirement of the dividing line!? **A:** Understand the Braisa as saying that tenufa does apply at the bamah of the tzibbur but does not apply at a private bamah.
  - **Others** say that **Rami bar Chama** said, the requirement that a bamah have the dividing line is only for a korbon of the tzibbur’s bamah that is brought on the tzibbur’s bamah. However, if it is a korbon of a private bamah, even if it is brought on the tzibbur’s bamah, it would be patur from this requirement.
    - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof to this from the Braisa that says that tenufa is only required for korbanos of the tzibbur’s bamah, but not for korbanos of a private bamah. Presumably the same would be true for the requirement to have the line! **A:** This is not a valid proof, because the Braisa may mean that tenufa only applies at the tzibbur’s bamah and not at a private bamah.
    - This version of **Rami bar Chama** argues on **R’ Elazar** who says that if one took the olah of a private bamah inside the curtains of the tzibbur’s bamah, the curtains make it take on all the chumros associated with the tzibbur’s bamah.

-----Daf דף---120-----

- **Q:** The Gemara just said that **R’ Elazar** said, that the olah of a private bamah that was shechted and was then brought within the curtains of the tzibbur’s bamah, it takes on all the chumros of a korbon of the tzibbur’s bamah. **R’ Zeira** asked, if an olah of a private bamah is taken within the curtains of the tzibbur’s bamah and is then removed, what is the halacha? Do we say that since it entered within the curtains it gets the status of a korbon of the tzibbur’s bamah and must therefore be brought back within the curtains, or do we say that once it was removed it need not be brought back?

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The Gemara asks, this question would seem to be the point of machlokes between the **Rabban and R' Yosef** in a Mishna!? The Mishna says, that if kodshei kodashim were shechted in the south of the Azarah (which is outside of their proper place), they are still subject to me'ilah. On this Mishna **Rabbah** said that if this korbon was brought up onto the Mizbe'ach it would have to be taken down and **R' Yosef** said it would not have to be taken down. Presumably this is because **Rabbah** holds that the Mizbe'ach does not elevate the status of something shechted outside of its place, and would similarly hold that the curtains around the tzibbur's bamah would not "take hold" of something that was shechted outside of the curtains, whereas **R' Yosef** would hold that it would!? **A:** The question can be asked according to **Rabbah**, because it may be that he holds that the Mizbe'ach is different in that it only "takes hold" of things that are fit for it, whereas the curtains around the tzibbur's bamah "take hold" even of things that are not fit for it, and can be asked according to **R' Yosef**, because he may say that in the Mishna the entire Azarah is really one place and therefore even when it is shechted in the south the Mizbe'ach can "take hold" of it, but the area outside the curtains of the tzibbur's bamah may be considered as a very different place than within, and therefore he may hold that the curtains do not "take hold" of it. Based on this, the Gemara leaves the question with a **TEIKU**.
- **Q: R' Yannai** asked, if the limbs of an olah of a private bamah were brought up onto the tzibbur's bamah, must they be taken down? Where the fire did not yet take hold of them it is clear that they must be taken down. The question is, what is the halacha if the fire already took hold of the limbs? **TEIKU**.
- With regard to a korbon that was shechted at night on a private bamah, there is a machlokes – **Rav** says it is valid and **Shmuel** says it is passul. They argue in how to answer a contradiction of pesukim raised by **R' Elazar**. One pasuk says that Shaul had the korbanos of a bamah shechted by day. Another pasuk says they were shechted at night. **Shmuel** would say that the first pasuk refers to korbanos whereas the second refers to animals of chullin that were being shechted for eating. **Rav** would say that the first pasuk refers to korbanos made kadosh for the tzibbur's bamah and the second pasuk refers to korbanos made kadosh for a private bamah.
- With regard to an olah of a private bamah, **Rav** says it does not need to be skinned and cut into pieces and **R' Yochanan** says it does. They are arguing in how to understand the statement of **R' Yose Haglili** in a Braisa where he says that the olah offered in the Midbar was not skinned or cut into pieces, because that requirement only began from when the Mishkan was put up. **R' Yochanan** holds that from that time it became a requirement for all olos, even the olah of a private bamah, and **Rav** holds that from that time on it became a requirement for an olah of the tzibbur's bamah, not for a private bamah.
  - There is a Braisa that says like **R' Yochanan**.

### AVAL ZMAN V'NOSSAR V'HATAMEI SHAVIN BAZEH UBAZEH

- A Braisa says, how do we know that korbanos of a private bamah are also subject to time limits for eating them? We would think to say that a korbon left overnight (beyond its period of when it may be eaten) is burned and a korbon that leaves its permitted place ("yotzeh") is burned – just as there is no psul of yotzeh for the korbon of a private bamah, maybe there is also no psul of "beyond its time" for such a korbon either. The Braisa asks, we have a kal v'chomer from bird korbanos that would say differently – birds do not become passul with a mum and yet they become passul with "beyond their time", so a korbon of a private bamah which does become passul with a mum would surely become passul with "beyond its time"! The Braisa says, we can refute this kal v'chomer by saying that bird korbanos are different in that the Avodah done to them may only be done by a Kohen. However, the Avodah on a private bamah may even be done by a non-Kohen and therefore we would say that maybe it also does not become passul with "beyond its time"! The Braisa says, therefore the pasuk says "v'zos toras zevach hashelamim", which teaches that the halachos of a shelamim are always the same – whether they are offered on a private bamah or the bamah of the tzibbur. This teaches that just as there is a psul of "beyond its time" by the korbon of the tzibbur's bamah, there is also such a psul for the korbon of a private bamah.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK PARAS CHATAS!!!**

# **Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah**

**HADRAN ALACH MESECHTA ZEVACHIM!!!**

**MAZEL TOV!!!**



# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## Maseches Menachos, Daf ב – Daf ה

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf ב---2-----

### MESECHTA MENACHOS

#### PEREK KOL HAMENACHOS -- PEREK RISHON

#### MISHNA

- All menachos whose kemitza was done not lishma, are valid but don't count for the owner to fulfil his obligation, except for a chatas mincha and a sotah's mincha, which become passul when they were done not lishma.
- If a chatas mincha or a sotah's mincha had their kemitza done not lishma, or if the kometz was put into a kli shareis not lishma, or was brought to the Mizbe'ach or burned on the Mizbe'ach not lishma, or if any of these were done lishma and not lishma, or not lishma and lishma, they become passul.
  - What is the case of "lishma and not lishma"? If he did the avodah for the sake of the chatas mincha and for the sake of a minchas nedavah. What is the case of "not lishma and lishma"? If he did the avodah for the sake of a minchas nedavah and for the sake of a chatas mincha.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** Why did the Mishna say "except" that they do not count for the obligation of their owners? Why couldn't it just say, they are valid "but" they do not count for the obligation of their owners? **A:** The Mishna is teaching that they don't count for the obligation of their owners, but they remain in their original state of kedusha, and therefore it would be assur to make any more changes during the remaining parts of the Avodah (e.g. all intent must be for the sake of this korbon).
  - This is as **Rava** said, that if an Olah is shechted not for its sake, it is still assur to offer its blood not for its sake. We can say this is based on logic and we can say it is based on a pasuk. The logic would be – just because there was one change that was made improperly, does that mean that we should go ahead and make more improper changes!? The pasuk would be "motza sifasecha tishmor v'asisa kasher nadarta laHashem Elokecha nedava..." The pasuk refers to the korbon as a neder and then as a nedava – this doesn't make sense!? Rather, the pasuk is teaching that if the korbon was brought properly, it will be considered a fulfillment of the obligation of the owner. If not, it will not fulfil the obligation, but will still be treated as a nedava. Now, it is not mutar to make improper changes to a nedava!
- **Q:** Maybe we must say that our Mishna does not follow the view of **R' Shimon** from a Braisa where he says that a korbon mincha that had the kemitza done for the sake of a different type of korbon mincha is valid and fulfils the obligation of the owner. The reason is that each type of mincha is noticeably different than the other (different methods of making the mixture) and therefore intent for something else won't make it passul, since we can clearly see what was actually offered. This is different than animal korbanos where the shechita, kabbalah, holacha, and zrika are the same by all. Now this is not a problem according to **R' Ashi** who explains a contradiction between **R' Shimon** in this Braisa and in another Braisa which says like our Mishna (that the mincha would be passul), that this Braisa is discussing where the Kohen does the kemitza of a machavas (a type of mincha) for the sake of a marcheshes (another type of mincha) and therefore it is valid, but the other Braisa is discussing where he does the kemitza of a "minchas machavas" for the sake of a "minchas marcheshes" (he mentions "mincha") in which case it is passul. Based on this we can say that our Mishna is also discussing where he mentioned "mincha" and that is why even **R' Shimon** holds it is passul. However, according to **Rabbah and Rava** (who answer the contradiction between the Braisos in other ways), it seems that they would have to say that our Mishna does not follow **R' Shimon**! You can't say that our Mishna can be reconciled with **R' Shimon** according to **Rabbah** in the same way that he reconciles the Braisos, that this Braisa is discussing a case where

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the intent was not lishma but was instead for a different korbon, whereas the other Braisa was discussing where it was not lishma for that owner (and that is why it is passul), and then say that our Mishna is also discussing where it was intended for a different owner, because our Mishna is clearly talking about not lishma for that korbon, but rather for a different korbon (as it gives the example for what is meant by “lishma” and “not lishma”)!? You also can't say that our Mishna can be reconciled with **R' Shimon** according to **Rava** in the same way that he reconciles the Braisos, that this Braisa is discussing a case where the not lishma intent was the taking of a kometz for a different type of mincha whereas in the other Braisa the intent was that he took the kometz for the sake of an animal korbon (and that is why it is passul) and then say that our Mishna is also discussing where it was intended for the sake of an animal korbon, because our Mishna is clearly talking about where he intended for another mincha (as can be seen from the example that it gives)!? **A:** Rather, we must say that according to **Rabbah and Rava** our Mishna does not follow the view of **R' Shimon**.

- **Q:** The Gemara has just referenced a contradiction between Braisos of the view of **R' Shimon**. The Gemara now discusses this in detail. There is a Braisa where **R' Shimon** says, the pasuk regarding a mincha that says “kachatash ka'asham” compares a mincha to a chatas and compares a mincha to an asham. This teaches that there are some menachos that are like a chatas and some that are like an asham – the chatas mincha is like a chatas and therefore if the kemitza is done not lishma it becomes passul, and the minchas nedava is like an asham and therefore if the kemitza is done not lishma it is still valid. Now this would seem to say further that it is like an asham in that it is valid but does not count for the owner's obligation. This contradicts **R' Shimon's** view in the Braisa quoted earlier!? **A: Rabbah** answers that the earlier Braisa is referring to where the avodah was done with intent for another type of mincha (and since it is plainly visible what type of mincha is being offered the intent is meaningless and the mincha is fully valid) whereas this second Braisa is referring to where the intent was for a different owner and that is why it is not fully valid.
  - **Q: Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, the fact that a mincha becomes passul based on improper intent is based on a hekesh, so why should there be a difference if the improper intent was regarding the type of mincha or the wrong owner? In either case it should be passul based on the hekesh!? **A: Rabbah** said, **R' Shimon** (as he does elsewhere) darshens the reasoning behind the pasuk, and therefore says that the pasuk only makes the improper intent passul when it is not obvious that the intent is improper. However, when it is intended as a different type of mincha, which is obviously not proper, it would not make the korbon passul.
  - **Q:** Based on this (that an intent for something that is obviously improper does not make the korbon passul), a bird olah whose melika was done above the line marking the halfway point of the Mizbe'ach should be fully valid (even if the Kohen did so for the sake of a chatas) since only the melika of an olah is done above the line, whereas the melika for a chatas would be done below the line!? **A:** The melika of a chatas can be done above the line as well. It is only the blood applications that must be done below the line. Therefore, if he did the melika of an olah for the sake of a chatas, it would not count for the owner's obligation.
  - **Q:** If the blood of an olah bird was squeezed above the line for the sake of a chatas, it should be fully valid, since only the application of an olah bird's blood is applied above the line!? **A:** The blood of a chatas bird is first sprinkled (and that *must* be done below the line) and the remainder is then squeezed. This squeezing of the remainder may be done even above the line. Therefore, the squeezing of the olah blood above the line does not necessarily show that it must be an olah.
  - **Q:** If the blood of a chatas bird was sprinkled below the line for the sake of an olah, it should be fully valid, since only the application of a chatas bird's blood is applied below the line, and only the blood of a chatas bird is sprinkled (the blood of an olah is squeezed)!? **A: R' Shimon** would actually hold that in this case the chatas would be fully valid. In fact, **R' Shimon** says that this concept (that its actions can sometimes be an obvious contradiction to the intent and thereby render the intent as meaningless) applies only to menachos “because menachos are not

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

comparable to animal korbanos”. He specifically says this would not apply to animal korbanos, which means that he would agree that this concept does apply to bird korbanos.

### -----Daf 3-----

- The Gemara said that **R’ Shimon** says that menachos are different than animal korbanos, meaning that although a mincha brought for the sake of another mincha can be fully valid (even to count for the obligation of the owner) an animal korban brought for the sake of another korban will never be valid to that extent (because the avodah of animal korbanos are the same for all korbanos – they all have shechita, kabbalah, etc.).
  - **Q:** The Gemara asks, that kodshei kodashim that were shechted in the north of the Azarah for the sake of kodshei kalim should be fully valid, because the fact that they are shechted in the north shows that they are not kodshei kalim!? **A:** Kodshei kalim may *even be* shechted in the south, but they may certainly be shechted in the north as well, and therefore the shechita in the north does not show that he is shechting kodshei kodashim.
  - **Q:** If kodshei kalim are shechted in the south for the sake of kodshei kodashim they should be fully valid, because if they were truly kodshei kodashim they would have to be shechted in the north!? **A:** People will say that they are truly kodshei kodashim and he is just being over the requirement to shecht it in the north. Therefore, it is not obvious that it is kodshei kalim.
    - **Q:** If this is true, then the same should be said when a machavas mincha was offered for the sake of a marcheshes mincha? Why do we say that since he is using a machavas keili it is obvious that it is a machavas? Maybe say that it is truly a marcheshes and he is over the requirement to bring it in a marcheshes keili!? **A:** The case of mincha is different, because a Mishna says, even if he made a neder to bring a marcheshes and then brought it in a machavas, or visa-versa, the korban has the status of a mincha of the keili in which it was brought, and he has not fulfilled his neder. Therefore, if it is brought in a machavas and the Kohen says it is for a marcheshes, it is obvious that it is a machavas and the intent is given no effect.
      - **Q:** That Mishna continues and says that if instead of making a neder, a person says “this flour” should be brought in a machavas and he then brought it in a marcheshes, or visa-versa, the korban is passul. Based on this, if the owner said “this flour”, the Kohen’s intent for the other mincha should make it passul, so why does **R’ Shimon** say that the intent is meaningless!? **A:** The Mishna is following the view of the **Rabanan**, but **R’ Shimon** would actually hold that even in this case the mincha becomes the type of mincha of which it is actually brought, and the Kohen’s intent is meaningless.
  - **Q:** If an olah is shechted for the sake of a chatas it should be fully valid, because the olah is only brought from male animals whereas a chatas is brought from females and the Kohen’s intent is therefore obviously false and should be meaningless!? **A:** There is the chatas of the Nasi which is a male goat, and therefore the intent is not obviously false.
    - **Q:** What if he brings an olah “for the sake of a chatas of an individual” (which can only be brought from females)? Furthermore, if a chatas of an individual is shechted for the sake of an olah it should be fully valid, since the fact that a female animal is used it shows that it cannot be an olah!? **A:** The animal’s tail blocks people from being able to tell the gender of the animal, and therefore the intent is not obviously false.
      - **Q:** That is true when a sheep is used, because it has a tail that can do that. What about when a goat is used? In that case the Kohen’s intent is obviously false!? **A:** Rather, people can’t easily tell the gender of an animal, and therefore the intent is not obviously false.
  - **Q:** A Pesach that was shechted for the sake of an asham should be fully valid, because a Korban Pesach must be in its first year and an asham must be in its second year!? **A:** An asham metzora and an asham nazir are brought when in their first year, and that may have been what the Kohen was referring to. Therefore it is not valid.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** What if he said that it is for the sake of an asham gezeilos or an asham me'ilos, which must be in their second year? Furthermore, if he shechts an asham gezeilos or asham me'ilos for the sake of a Pesach it should be fully valid!? **A:** Rather, people don't recognize the age of the animal, because there are younger animals that look older and visa-versa.
- **Q:** If a goat is shechted for the sake of an asham (which must be a sheep) it should be fully valid, since a goat does not have wool and a sheep does (and the intent is therefore obviously false)!? **A:** People will think that the goat is a black ram, which can be brought for an asham.
- **Q:** If a calf or a par is shechted for the sake of a Pesach or an asham it should be fully valid, because such animals can't brought for a Pesach or an asham!? **A:** These korbanos would actually be fully valid. When **R' Shimon** said that animal korbanos are never fully valid when they are brought for the sake of another korbon, he meant that *most* animal korbanos are like that, but there are exceptions.
- The Gemara had posed a contradiction – in one Braisa **R' Shimon** said that a mincha offered not lishma is fully valid and in another Braisa he said that it does not count to fulfil the owner's obligation. **Rava** now answers that in the first Braisa **R' Shimon** is referring to where the Kohen did the kemitza for the sake of another mincha and since the pasuk says "v'zos Toras hamincha" all menachos are considered to have the same halachos, whereas in the second Braisa he is referring to where the kemitza was done for the sake of an animal korbon.
  - **Q:** **R' Shimon** gave his reasoning as being that the avodah of each mincha is distinct and the wrong intent is therefore obviously false. He did not base his view on a pasuk!? **A:** **R' Shimon** means to say, even though the avodah is obviously false, which would be a bigger reason to say that the korbon is passul, since the pasuk says "v'zos Toras hamincha" it remains valid. This is not true for animal korbanos. Even though their avodos are the same, still there is no pasuk that equates them all.
    - **Q:** If so, when one chatas is brought for the sake of another chatas (e.g. a chatas brought for the aveira of cheilev is brought for the sake of the aveira of eating blood) it should be fully valid based on the pasuk of "v'zos Toras hachatas"!? **A:** According to **R' Shimon** these chatas would be valid
- **R' Ashi** answered the contradiction between the Braisos by saying that the first Braisa is referring to where he did the kometz of a machavas for a marcheshes, and the second Braisa is where he did the kometz of a minchas machavas for the sake of a minchas marcheshes. In the first case he is stating his intent for the type of keili, and that does not make a korbon passul. In the second case he is offering it for a different type of korbon, and that does effect the validity of the korbon.
  - **Q:** **R' Shimon** gave his reason as being that the avodah shows what type of korbon he is actually bringing. This would seem to be giving a reason why it is fully valid even when he intends for the sake of another "mincha"!? **A:** **R' Shimon** means to say, even though the intent is obviously false and the mincha would therefore seem to be passul, since the intent was for a type of keili rather than for a type of mincha, the korbon remains fully valid.
  - **Q:** **R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, if the Kohen offers a "dry mincha" for the sake of a "mixed one" (one mixed with a lot of oil), he is clearly not offering it for a type of keili, and therefore **R' Shimon** should say that it is passul!? **A:** Since he doesn't say it is for the sake of another "mincha" we assume that he meant it was for the sake of some other mixture, and therefore it remains fully valid.
    - **Q:** If so, if an olah is brought for the sake of a shelamim, **R' Shimon** should say it is fully valid, because we should similarly assume that he intends for "the sake of shalom"!? **A:** That case is different, because the korbon itself is called a shelamim. In the case of the mincha, the korbon itself is not called a "mixed one" it is called "mixed with oil".
- **Rava and R' Ashi** don't answer the contradiction as **Rabbah** did, because they say that an intent that is obviously false is more of a reason to say that the korbon is passul. **Rabbah and R' Ashi** don't say like **Rava**, because they don't darshen the "zos Toras" in that way. **Rabbah and Rava** don't answer like **R' Ashi**, because they are bothered by the question of **R' Acha the son of Rava**.
- We find that **R' Hoshaya** actually asked this matter of machlokes between **Rabbah and Rava**. He asked, what would **R' Shimon** say if a mincha was brought for the sake of an animal korbon? Is his reasoning based on the fact that the intent is obviously false and therefore this is no different and the korbon would be valid, or is his

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

reasoning based on “v’zos Toras hamincha”, and since this is offered for the sake of an animal korbon it would be passul? He did not follow **Rabbah** because of **Abaye’s** question on him. He did not follow **Rava**, because he felt that if we darshen “v’zos Toras hamincha” in that way we should also darshen “v’zos Toras hachatas” in that way and we do not find that **R’ Shimon** holds that way in all respects. He does not hold like **R’ Ashi** because of the question of **R’ Acha the son of Rava**.

### -----Daf 7---4-----

#### CHUTZ M’MINCHAS CHOTEI UMINCHAS KENA’OS

- **Q:** We can understand why the chatas mincha becomes passul when offered not lishma, because the pasuk calls it a chatas, and a chatas becomes passul when offered not lishma. However, why does a sotah’s mincha become passul when it is offered not lishma? **A:** We have learned that **R’ Nachman** says there is a gezeira shava between chatas and a sotah’s mincha, which teaches (among other things) that if the sotah’s mincha is offered not lishma, it becomes passul.
  - **Q:** If so, an asham that is offered not lishma should also become fully passul, because there is a gezeira shava of “avon” between chatas and asham!? **A:** By asham the word is “avono” and by chatas the word is “avon” and therefore we don’t darshen a gezeira shava.
    - **Q:** The yeshiva of **R’ Yishmael** taught that even “v’shav haKohen” and “ubah haKohen” can be used for a gezeira shava, so certainly “avono” and “avon” can be used!? Also, even by chatas there is a pasuk that says “avono”!? **A:** Rather, the gezeira shava only teaches regarding something else (that just as the leftover money of a chatas is used for a nedavah, so too the leftover money of a sotah’s mincha and an asham are used for a nedavah) but does not teach regarding lishma. Although we say that a gezeira shava always teaches regarding all halachos, not just some select halachos, regarding lishma of the chatas the pasuk says “osah”, which teaches that only a chatas becomes passul when it is brought not lishma.
    - **Q:** We are then back to our question, how do we know that the chatas mincha and the sotah’s mincha become passul when they are brought not lishma? **A:** We learn that a chatas must be brought lishma because the pasuk says the word “hu”. The pasuk regarding these also says “hu” (or the similar “hee”) and therefore they must be brought lishma.
      - **Q:** The pasuk regarding asham also says “hu” and we should therefore also say that it is passul when offered not lishma!? **A:** The “hu” written regarding an asham is written after the burning of the pieces that go on the Mizbe’ach, and as a Braisa says, this “hu” therefore can’t be used to teach the validity of the korbon regarding the halacha of lishma.
        - **Q:** If so, what does the “hu” written regarding an asham teach? **A:** It teaches the halacha of **R’ Huna in the name of Rav**, that if an asham was assigned to graze until it gets a mum, and someone took the animal and offered it without intent for any specific korbon, it is valid as an olah. However, this is only after it has been transferred over to a shepherd to hold until it gets a mum. If it was offered before that was done, it would be passul.
- **Rav** said, if the Omer mincha had the kemitza done not lishma, it becomes completely passul. The reason is that it is brought to be matir the new grain and it wasn’t brought for that purpose, so it is passul. The same can be said for the asham of a nazir and the asham of a metzora that were shechted not lishma – that they become completely passul, because they must be brought to begin the validation process of the owner and they weren’t brought for that purpose.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna says that all menachos whose kemitza was done not lishma are valid except for the chatas mincha and the sotah’s mincha. These seem to be the only exceptions!? **A:** The Mishna is only referring to menachos of an individual, not of a tzibbur; only to menachos that are brought on their own, not those brought along with an animal korbon; and only to those that don’t have a set time to be brought, not to those that have a set time.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Mishna says that all korbanos that are shechted not lishma are valid but don't fulfil the obligation of their owners, except for a chatas and a Pesach, which are fully passul if shechted not lishma. These seem to be the only exceptions!? **A:** Since there are some ashamos (the asham gezeilos and me'ilos) which are valid if shechted not lishma, the Mishna could not include "asham" as an exception and say that it is passul when shechted not lishma.
  - **Q:** Why are these ashamos (the asham gezeilos and me'ilos) different? Why don't we say that since they are brought to bring a kapparah and they were not brought from that purpose they should become passul!? **A:** **R' Yirmiya** said, we find that the Torah makes a difference between a korbon brought as a kapparah and one brought to validate a person. A korbon brought for a kapparah can sometimes be brought after the death of the person even though it cannot achieve a kapparah for him at that time. This shows that we bring a korbon of kapparah even though it will not fulfil its intended purpose. This is why the asham gezeilos and me'ilos are valid even when offered not lishma even though they will not fulfil the obligation of the owner. On the other hand, we never find that a validating korbon is brought after death. This shows that a validating korbon is not valid if it cannot accomplish its intended purpose.
    - **Q:** **R' Yehuda the son of R' Shimon ben Pazi** asked, we find that the validating korbanos of a nazir – the olah and the shelamim – are at times brought even after his death!? **A:** **R' Pappa** said, **R' Yirmiya** meant that we never find that a validating korbon that is the only way that the person can be validated, may be brought after his death. A nazir can be validated without the asham and the olah, as long as he brings his chatas, and therefore we can't bring a proof from them.
  - **Q:** A Braisa clearly says that the asham of a metzora that was shechted not lishma is still offered on the Mizbe'ach!? This is a **TEYUFTA** of **Rav**!

### -----Daf 17-----5-----

- **Reish Lakish** (argues on **Rav** and) says that if the Omer mincha has its kemitza taken not lishma, it is valid, but the remainder of that mincha may not be eaten until another Omer mincha is offered and is matir the first one to be eaten.
  - **Q:** If it can't be eaten, how can it be offered on the Mizbe'ach? The pasuk says "mimashkei Yisrael" which we darshen to teach that a korbon may only be brought from something that is mutar for the Yidden to eat!? **A:** **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, **Reish Lakish** holds that since it will become mutar later that same day, it is not considered to be premature and may therefore be offered on the Mizbe'ach.
    - **Q:** **R' Ada the son of R' Yitzchak** asked, a Braisa lists the aspects that bird korbanos have which menachos don't, and visa-versa. According to what was just said, the Braisa should also have listed that a mincha (in the case discussed above) is an exception to the general rule in that it is mutar to be offered even though it is assur to be eaten!? **A:** Since he holds that this is not an issue, because it will become mutar to eat later that same day, it is not even considered to be something that is assur, and would not be considered as an exception to the rule.
    - **Q:** **R' Sheishes** asked, a Braisa says that if the application of the oil to a metzora was done out of order – either it was done before the blood applications or was done before the oil was sprinkled 7 times towards the Kodesh – he should again do the oil applications after the blood applications or after the oil is properly sprinkled. Now, if we hold that something that will be done that day does not have an issue of being premature, the oil application should not have to be done again, because it should not be viewed as having been done prematurely!? **A:** **R' Pappa** said, the case of metozra is different, because the pasuk says "tihiyeh", which teaches that the order must be strictly followed.
    - **Q:** **R' Pappa** asked, a Braisa says that if the metzora's chatas was shechted before his asham (which is the wrong order), the chatas blood should be left overnight to become passul and burned off the Mizbe'ach. Now, if we hold that something that will be done that day does not have an issue of being premature, the chatas should not become passul just because it was

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

shechted prematurely!? The Gemara asks, **R' Pappa** has himself just said that the case of metzora is different, because the pasuk teaches that the order must be strictly followed!? Rather, **R' Pappa** meant to say that the pasuk teaches that the order of the *Avodah* must be strictly followed, and shechita is not an *Avodah*, so why does the out of order shechita make it passul!? The chatas blood should be mixed until the asham could be shechted and offered and then the chatas blood should be offered!? **A:** Rather, **R' Pappa** said, the reason **Reish Lakish** holds it is valid is because he holds that at sunrise on the 16<sup>th</sup> of Nisnon the new grain is already mutar to eat (and therefore the leftover mincha of the Omer offered not lishma is actually mutar to be eaten). In fact, we find that **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** both say that the new grain becomes mutar with the rise of the sun on the 16<sup>th</sup> of Nisnon.

- **Rava** said, that if the Omer mincha has its kemitza taken not lishma, it is valid, and the remainder of that mincha may be eaten and does not need another Omer to be matir it. The reason is that an invalidating intent is only effective when it comes from someone who is fit to do the *Avodah* (which excludes a Kohen with a mum), with something that is fit for the *Avodah* (which excludes the Omer mincha since it is not fit for any other type of korbon, because it is made of barley), and in a place that is fit for the *Avodah* (which excludes a time when the Mizbe'ach is damaged).
- A Braisa says that the extra word “min habakar” comes to exclude a treifa from being brought as a korbon. The Braisa asks, we should know this based on a kal v'chomer – if a baal mum, which is mutar for an individual, is assur for a korbon, then a treifa, which is assur for an individual, should certainly be assur for a korbon! The Braisa says that cheilev and blood refute that, because they are assur for individuals and are mutar to be offered. The Braisa asks, cheilev and blood are different, because they come from an animal that is mutar, but a treifa is entirely assur and therefore should certainly be assur to be offered!? The Braisa says that melika refutes this, because a bird killed with melika is entirely assur to an individual and yet is mutar for the Mizbe'ach! The Braisa says this is not a proof. Melika is different, because the thing that makes it kadosh (i.e. the melika) is what also makes it assur, whereas by a treifa this is not the case! Therefore, there is a valid kal v'chomer to teach that a treifa may not be brought as a korbon. If you will respond that the kal v'chomer is still flawed, I will tell you that the extra word “min habakar” comes to exclude a treifa from being brought as a korbon.
  - **Q:** What does the Braisa mean when it says, “If you will respond that the kal v'chomer is still flawed”? The Braisa has proven that it is a valid kal v'chomer!? **A: Rav** said, we can say that the Omer mincha refutes the kal v'chomer, because it is assur for an individual and yet is mutar for the Mizbe'ach.
    - **Q:** We can ask that we can't refute from the Omer, because it is matir the new grain and therefore can't be used to teach regarding treifah!? **A:** The Gemara says, the proof is from the Omer during the year of shmitta, when it is not matir the grains.
      - **Q:** Even during shmitta it is matir the grains that grow on their own during shmitta!? **A:** The Braisa follows **R' Akiva** who says that even these grains are assur on shmitta.
      - **Q: R' Acha bar Abba** said to **R' Ashi**, even according to **R' Akiva** we should ask that the Omer can't be used as a proof, because even during shmitta it permits the new grains of chutz laaretz!? Even if you hold that that is only D'Rabanan, we can say that the Omer comes to remove the lav on the flour of the Omer itself!? **A: R' Acha MiDifit** said to **Ravina**, if not for the pasuk we would think that just as the Omer is a valid korbon, a treifa should also be a valid korbon and it would remove the lav against the eating of a treifa.
  - **Reish Lakish** said, that the Braisa means that the kal v'chomer can be refuted from the case of the making of the ketores, which is something that is assur for an individual but is mutar for the Mizbe'ach.
    - **Q:** The Gemara asks, this is not a valid proof, because the making of the ketores is different in that it is the only way to fulfil the mitzvah of the ketores, whereas one can bring a korbon without having to bring a treifa!?
  - **Mar the son of Ravina** said, that the Braisa means that the kal v'chomer can be refuted from the case of doing melachah on Shabbos, which is assur for an individual, but is mutar for the Mizbe'ach!

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The Gemara asks, this is not a valid proof, because melachah on Shabbos is even mutar for an individual when it comes to a bris milah!? **A:** This is not a question! Bris milah is not *for an individual* – it is for a mitzvah!
  - Rather, the question would be, Shabbos is different, because the only way to fulfill the mitzvah of the korbanos that must be brought on Shabbos is by doing melachah on Shabbos.
- **R' Ada bar Abba** said, the Braisa means that the kal v'chomer can be refuted from the case of kilayim, which is assur for an individual and yet is mutar for the Kohen Gadol to wear for the Avodah!
  - **Q:** The Gemara asks, this is not a valid proof, because kilayim is even mutar for an individual when it comes to tzitzis!? **A:** This is not a question! Tzitzis is not *for an individual* – it is for a mitzvah!
    - Rather, the question would be, kilayim is different, because the only way to fulfill the mitzvah of the korbanos with the bigdei kehunah is for the Kohen Gadol to wear kilayim.