



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Menachos, Daf א – Daf ב

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 א--6-----

- 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

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **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 korbbon 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 korbbon 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 korbbon 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 korbbon 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.

-----Daf 7-----

- The Gemara quoted 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.
 - **Q:** **R' Nachman** asked, what do these Tanna'im hold? If they hold that the kemitza done by a passul is an Avodah that can make the korbbon passul, then even if it was never put into a kli shareis it should not be allowed to be returned to the other flour and done again!? If they hold that it is not an Avodah, then

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

why does it become passul when it is put into a kli shreis? **A: R' Nachman** said, in truth it is an Avodah, but it does not become a completed Avodah until it is put into a kli shareis.

- **Q:** If so, then even if it is not put into a kli shareis after the kemitza, but is instead put back into the original kli shareis with the other flour, that should also make it kadosh (it too is a kli shareis) and should therefore become passul!? **A: R' Yochanan** said, we see from here that a kli shareis only makes something kodesh when the item is put there with intent that it should become kodesh (and when he returns the kometz he does not have this intent).
 - **Q:** This suggests that with intent a kli shareis will even make a passul item kodesh. However, we find that **R' Yochanan** said that a kli shareis will not make a passul item kodesh!? **A:** He holds that it won't make it kodesh to the extent that it can then be offered, but he does hold that it makes it kodesh to the extent that it could then make it passul.
 - **R' Amram** said, that the reason it does not become kadosh when it is put back into the original keili is because the case is where the flour was put back onto a pile of flour, so that it sits above the rim of the keili. Since it has never gone into the keili, it does not become kadosh.
 - **Q:** If it is above the rim, how did he initially take the kometz? The kometz must be taken from flour that is *within* the keili!? **A:** Rather, the pile of flour did not reach above the rim, so when he took the kometz he took it from within the keili.
 - **Q:** If so, when he took the kometz he created a void in the pile, and when he returns the flour he returns it into that void, which is within the keili and should therefore make it kadosh!? **A:** He returns the kometz on top of the flour on the side of the keili, and the kometz therefore sits above the rim of the keili. He then shakes the keili to allow the kometz flour to fall back into the void in the middle from where he took the kometz. However, when the kometz falls back within the keili from that movement it is not considered to be from a person placing it there, and it therefore does not become kadosh.
- **R' Yirmiya** asked **R' Zeira**, why couldn't we answer that the case is that he returned the kometz to the keili while it was sitting on the ground and say that a keili on the floor only makes something kadosh when it is being held? Should we say that this proves that one may even do a kemitza from a keili that is on the ground and there is no requirement for the keili to be held in order for it to make something kodesh? **R' Zeira** said, you have touched upon the question that **R' Nachman** asked **Avimi**, when they were discussing the proper method of kemitza, and **Avimi** told him that the keili can't be sitting on the floor, but rather must be held by a Kohen when the kemitza is being taken and when the kemitza is then put into another keili. **R' Nachman** asked, a Mishna regarding piggul discusses all the necessary Avodos associated with a mincha, and makes no mention of lifting the keili off the ground. This would seem to say that there is no such requirement!? **Avimi** said, the Mishna only listed the Avodos that are done by the main Kohen who is doing most of the Avodos of that mincha. The lifting of the keili had to be done by another Kohen (because the Kohen doing the kemitza could not lift the keili while busy with the kemitza) and therefore it is not mentioned in that Mishna.
- They asked **R' Sheishes** whether kemitza may be done from a keili that is on the ground. **R' Sheishes** said, let's examine how they did the Avodah in the Beis Hamikdash. The Mishna regarding the Lechem Hapanim enumerates that the changing of the Lechem Hapanim needed 4 Kohanim to remove the Lechem Hapanim and spoons of levonah from the Shulchan and 4 to bring in the new Lechem Hapanim and spoons of levonah. The Mishna does not list the need for a Kohen to lift the Shulchan while the levonah is

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

being removed (which is considered to be a kemitza), which shows that a kemitza can be done even when the keili is on the ground.

- **Q:** Why don't we say like **Avimi** just said, that the Mishna only lists the main Avodos, not the other Kohanim who are needed to assist? **A:** In the previous Mishna the Mishna does not give the number of Kohanim needed, so that is a valid answer. This Mishna tells us the number of Kohanim that are needed. Therefore, if a Kohen would be needed to lift the Shulchan it would have listed it. The fact that it does not, proves that a kemitza may be done from a keili that is on the ground. **SHEMAH MINAH.**
- **Rava** said, it is obvious to me that a kemitza may be done from a keili that is on the ground, as can be seen from the removal of the spoons of levonah from the Shulchan. It is also obvious that one can make a mincha kodesh by putting it into a keili that is on the ground, as can be seen from the putting of the spoons of levonah onto the Shulchan. **Rava** asked, what about making the kometz kadosh by putting it into a keili on the ground after the kemitza was done? Do we learn this from the mincha itself, which can become kadosh in a keili on the ground, or do we learn it from the blood of an animal korbon, whose kabbalah must be in a keili that is held by the Kohen? **Rava** then answered, that we learn it from the blood of a korbon, and the keili must therefore be held by a Kohen.
 - **Q: Rava** has said that if a kometz was split and put into two keilim, it is kadosh. Now, if he learns the kometz from the blood of an animal, it should not become kodesh in two keilim, as is the case of the blood!? **A: Rava** reversed his view here and agreed that the kemitza would not become kadosh if split into two keilim.
 - **Q:** How do we know that blood does not become kadosh when split into two keilim? **A:** We see this in a Braisa regarding chatas waters, in which **R' Tachlifa ben Shaul** said, if the Kohen was mekadesh less than the amount needed in one keili and a similar amount in another keili, they do not become kadosh. They then asked, does this concept apply to blood of a korbon as well? Do we say that regarding chatas water it is a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai and we therefore can't learn from it to the case of blood, or do we say that we learn it there from the pasuk of "v'taval bamayim", and since by blood it says "v'taval...badam" we learn the same concept for blood as well? **R' Zrika in the name of R' Elazar** said, that even in the case of blood it would not become kadosh.
 - **Rava** brings a Braisa which explicitly says this as well, that the entire required amount of blood must be received into one keili.
 - This Braisa also says that the pasuk of "min hadam" teaches that the blood applications on the inside Mizbe'ach must be done with the blood that is discussed in that parsha. **Rava** explains, this comes to exclude the using of leftover blood on the Kohen's finger that was still there from the previous application. This supports **R' Elazar** who says that the blood from one sprinkling that is left on the finger of the Kohen cannot be used for the next sprinkling (rather, he must again dip his finger into the blood for each sprinkling).
 - **Q: Ravin bar R' Ada** said to **Rava**, your talmid said in the name of **R' Amram** that a Braisa says that if the blood from the Kohen's finger went onto a garment the halacha is as follows: if he had not yet sprinkled it, the garment requires washing. If he had, it does not require washing. Presumably, this means that if he had not yet finished all the required sprinklings (all 7) it

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

would require washing. This shows that the blood left on the finger is valid for all of the sprinklings!? **A:** The Braisa means that if a sprinkling was not yet done after he dipped his finger into the blood, the garment requires washing. However, if he did one sprinkling since the dipping, it would not require washing even if he still has to do more sprinklings. This is because each sprinkling requires him to again dip his finger into the blood in the keili.

- **Q: Abaye** asked, a Mishna says that after the Kohen finishes sprinkling the blood of the parah adumah he wipes off the blood from his hand onto the body of the cow. This suggests that this is only done after all of the sprinklings, not after each of the sprinklings, which shows that the blood left after one sprinkling may be used for the next!? **A: Rava** answered, the Mishna means that after all the sprinklings he wipes his *hand*, but in between each sprinkling he only wipes his *finger*, not his entire hand.
 - **Q:** If he wipes his finger between sprinklings on the cow his finger will be dirty and not fit for doing the Avodah!?
A: Abaye said, he wipes it on the edge of the bowl.
 - **Q: Did R' Elazar** really say that the blood does not become kadosh if the minimum amount is not taken in one keili? We find that he says the chavitei mincha of the Kohen Gadol may be made kadosh in halves since it is offered in halves. Now, if he holds regarding blood that it may not be split, he should learn the mincha from the blood and say that it may not be done!? You can't say that he doesn't learn one korbon from another, because we find that he learns an aspect of kemitza from the removal of the levonah from on top of the Shulchan!? **A:** He learns one type of mincha from another, but he doesn't learn a mincha from the blood of an animal korbon.

-----Daf 7--8-----

- The Gemara had quoted a machlokes regarding the chavitei Kohen Gadol (the mincha he brings daily, offering half in the morning and half in the afternoon). **R' Yochanan** said it can't be made kadosh in halves and **R' Elazar** said, since it is offered in halves, it can also be made kadosh in halves.
 - **R' Acha** said, **R' Yochanan** darshens the pasuk of "mincha...machatzisah", as teaching that first it should be brought as a complete mincha, and is then split into halves.
 - **Q:** There are two Braisos that clearly say that the mincha is to be made kadosh when *complete* and then split into halves!? **A:** The Braisos are giving the way it should be done l'chatchila.
 - **Q: R' Geviha of Bei Kasil** asked **R' Ashi**, the pasuk says "chukah", which means that this is the way it must be done even b'dieved!? **A:** That is regarding the requirement that the Kohen Gadol bring the full amount needed from his house. However, once he has done so, it may even be made kadosh half at a time.
 - **Q:** We have learned regarding a regular mincha that **R' Yochanan** argues on **Rav** and says that if a person designated half the amount needed, with the intent to add to it later, it becomes kadosh. If **R' Yochanan** holds that regarding chavitei it cannot be made kadosh in halves, why doesn't he learn the case of the regular mincha from the case of the chavitei!? **A: R' Yochanan** only says it becomes kadosh because the case is that he intends to add to get to the full amount. The case of the chavitei was not like that, and that is why he says that it does not become kadosh. We see this logic used by **R' Yose** in a Braisa as well.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Who does **Rav** follow regarding chavitin? If he holds like **R' Elazar**, he should say that a regular mincha can be made kadosh in halves just like can be done by the chavitin!? **A:** It must be that he holds like **R' Yochanan**.
- **Rav** said, a mincha can be made kadosh without oil, since we find that the Lechem Hapanim is brought without oil. A mincha can be made kadosh without levonah, since we find that a minchas nesachim is brought without levonah. A mincha can be made kadosh without oil and without levonah, since we find that a chatas mincha is brought without oil and levonah. Also, the oil and levonah for a mincha can each be made kadosh on their own – the fact that oil can be made kadosh on its own is learned from a metzora, where oil is made kadosh on its own, and the fact that levonah can be made kadosh on its own is learned from the spoons of levonah of the Lechem Hapanim, where levonah is made kadosh on its own. **R' Chanina** said, no part can be made kadosh on its own.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Chanina**, why is there even a keili the size of an issaron? That would only be large enough to measure flour and he holds that the flour cannot be made kadosh on its own!? **A:** It would be used for a chatas mincha, where only flour is brought.
 - **Q:** Why is there a keili the size of a log? **A:** It would be used for the log of oil needed for a metzora.
 - We find that **Shmuel** holds like **Rav**. A Mishna says, keilim used for liquids make liquids kadosh and measures used for solids make solids kadosh. Keilim used for liquids do not make solids kadosh, and measures used for solids do not make liquids kadosh. On that Mishna **Shmuel** said, when the Mishna said that keilim used for liquids are only mekadesh liquids, that is referring to measures used for liquids. However, the bowls used for liquids can even make solids kadosh, as the pasuk says “shneyhem milei'ihm soles”. This presumably refers to dry flour, and shows that he holds that even flour by itself can become kadosh.
 - **Q:** **R' Acha MiDifti** asked **Ravina**, the mincha referred to in the pasuk was moist (it was mixed with oil) and maybe that is why the bowl makes it kadosh, but maybe a true solid would not become kadosh in the bowls used for liquids!? **A:** **Ravina** said, the pasuk teaches that even the dry pieces in the mixture become kadosh in the bowl. We can also answer that a mincha, even when mixed with oil, is still considered to be a dry solid substance when compared to blood.
- We have learned, **R' Elazar** said, if the kemitza was done in the Heichal it is valid, for that is what is done when the two spoons of levonah are taken from the Shulchan.
 - **Q:** **R' Yirmiya** asked, a Braisa says that the pasuk of “v'kamatz misham” teaches that the kemitza must be done in a place where a non-Kohen is allowed to be (which would not include the Heichal)!? **A:** **R' Yirmiya** or **R' Yaakov** answered, the Braisa means that the pasuk teaches that the entire Azarah is fit to have the kemitza done in it. We would have thought that it must be done in the north, just like the shechita of an olah, since the mincha is also kodshei kodashim.
 - **Q:** It cannot be compared to an olah, because an olah is totally burned on the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** We would learn it from chatas.
 - **Q:** It cannot be compared to a chatas, because a chatas provides kappara for sins that carry the kares penalty!? **A:** We would learn it from ashram.
 - **Q:** It cannot be compared to an ashram, because an ashram is a blood offering!? In fact, we couldn't even learn it from all these three together for this reason!? **A:** Rather, we would say that the pasuk creates a hekesh from the requirement to bring the mincha to the Mizbe'ach, to the kemitza. We would think that this teaches that just as bringing it to the Mizbe'ach is done at the southwest corner,

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

maybe the kemitza must be done there as well. The pasuk of “misham” therefore teaches that the kemitza may be done anywhere in the Azarah.

- **R’ Yochanan** said, a shelamim that was sheched in the Heichal is valid, based on the pasuk of “Ush’chato pesach Ohel Moed”. This suggests that shechting it in the Azarah is only valid because of the entrance of the Ohel Moed. If so, the secondary place (the Azarah) cannot be better than the primary place (the Heichal).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, **R’ Yehuda ben Beseira** said, we learn from a pasuk that if goyim have besieged the Azarah, the Kohanim may go and eat kodshei kodashim in the Heichal. Now, according to **R’ Yochanan** we should not need a special pasuk for this! The pasuk says, “Bachatzar Ohel Moed yochluha”, which suggests that eating it in the Azarah is only valid because of the entrance of the Ohel Moed. If so, the secondary place (the Azarah) cannot be better than the primary place (the Heichal)!? **A:** These two cases cannot be compared. **R’ Yochanan** was talking about doing an Avodah, which is something one should certainly be able to do in a more holy place. The Braisa is referring to eating, which may be something that should not be done in a more holy place. That is why the pasuk is needed.

-----Daf 9-----

- We have learned, if the mincha was mixed with oil outside the Azarah, **R’ Yochanan** says it is passul and **Reish Lakish** says it is valid. **Reish Lakish** says it is valid, based on the pasuk that first says “V’yatzak aleha shemen v’nossan aleha levonah” and later says “Veheviya ehl bnei Aharon hakohanim v’kamatz”. This teaches that from the kemitza and on all must be done by a Kohen. This means that the pouring of the oil and mixing may even be done by a non-Kohen. Since it doesn’t require Kehuna, it also doesn’t need to be done in the Azarah. **R’ Yochanan** says it is passul, because the mixing must be done in a kli shareis. So, although it doesn’t require a Kohen, it does require that it be done in the Azarah. There is a Braisa that says like **R’ Yochanan**.
- We have learned, if the mincha became deficient before the kemitza, **R’ Yochanan** says we can bring more flour from elsewhere to complete the measure, and **Reish Lakish** says we may not do that. **R’ Yochanan** says we may do so, because the kemitza is what establishes it as a mincha, and therefore, before that point the mincha is not considered as deficient and we can add new flour. **Reish Lakish** says that the putting it into a keili establishes it as a mincha.
 - **Q:** **R’ Yochanan** asked **Reish Lakish**, the Mishna regarding the metzora’s oil says that if it became deficient before it was poured, he may add more oil to it. Now, this is so even though it was already in a keili!? **TEYUFTA** of **Reish Lakish**.
- We have learned, if the remaining flour of a mincha became deficient between the kemitza and the burning of the kometz, **R’ Yochanan** says he may still burn the kometz and **Reish Lakish** says that he may not.
 - They would both agree that according to **R’ Eliezer** the kometz should be burned, because he says in a Mishna that even if all the remaining flour was lost the kometz is burned. The machlokes is according to **R’ Yehoshua**, who says that if all the remaining flour is lost the kometz is not burned. **Reish Lakish** says that **R’ Yehoshua** would say the same thing even when only some of the remaining flour is missing. **R’ Yochanan** says that **R’ Yehoshua** says it should be burned. In the Mishna he says it is not burned only because *all* of the flour was missing.
 - We see this concept (that there is a difference between some of the flour missing and all of the flour missing) in a Braisa, where **R’ Yehoshua** says regarding an animal korbon whose meat and cheilev are missing, that as long as there is a kezayis that remains, the zrika may still be done. Presumably, he would say the same thing regarding a mincha, that as long as some of the flour remains, the mincha remains valid.
 - **Reish Lakish** would say that a mincha is different than an animal korbon, because the pasuk says “*hamincha*”, which teaches that unless the entire mincha is there, the kometz may not be burned. **R’ Yochanan** says the pasuk says “*min hamincha*”, which

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

teaches that as long as the mincha was complete at the time of the kemitza it remains valid even if it then became deficient.

- **Q: R' Yochanan** asked **Reish Lakish**, a Braisa says that if the Lechem Hapanim broke after it was removed from the Shulchan (which is the equivalent of the kemitza), its levonah (which is the equivalent of the kometz) may be burned. This means, that if it becomes deficient after the kemitza it does not become passul. This refutes **Reish Lakish**!? **A: Reish Lakish** said, this Braisa follows **R' Eliezer**.
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** asked, I stated an anonymous Mishna, and you are saying that it only follows **R' Eliezer**!? If the Mishna follows **R' Eliezer**, it should not just give the case where the Lechem Hapanim broke (and was missing some), but should rather give the case of where it became totally destroyed!? **Reis Lakish** remained quiet.
 - **Q:** Why did he remain quiet? Why didn't he say that a korbon of the tzibbur (like the Lechem Hapanim) is different, in that since tumah is mutar for them, they are also mutar even if they are deficient!? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** said, from the fact that this answer was not given we can learn that a deficient mincha is like a baal mum, and just as a baal mum is not mutar for a korbon of the tzibbur, a deficient mincha would also not be mutar.
 - **R' Pappa** was repeating this and **R' Yosef** said to him, aren't **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** even discussing the Omer mincha, and yet they still argue? Therefore, **Reish Lakish** could not have answered that the korbon of a tzibbur is different.
- **Q: R' Malkiyo** asked, two Braisos each give a pasuk to teach that a deficient mincha is passul. Now, why are two pesukim needed to teach this? Presumably, one is to teach regarding a mincha that became deficient before the kemitza and one is to teach regarding where it became deficient between the kemitza and the burning of the kometz. This refutes **R' Yochanan** on both points!? **A:** That is not what the two pesukim come to teach. Rather, one pasuk teaches that if a mincha becomes deficient before the kemitza, if he brings more flour to complete the mincha it will be valid, and if he does not it will not be valid. The other pasuk teaches that if the leftover flour became deficient between the kemitza and the burning of the kometz, even if he then burns the kometz, the leftover flour may not be eaten.
 - This last ruling is actually the subject of a machlokes between **Ze'iri**, who says that the leftover flour may not be eaten in this case, and **R' Yannai**, who says that it may be eaten.

KAMATZ BISMOL...

- **Q:** How do we know this? **A: R' Zeira** said, the pasuk says "Vayakreiv es hamincha vayimlaei kapo mimena". In another pasuk regarding the metzora's oil the pasuk says that the Kohen should pour it on the "left kaf" of another Kohen. This shows that when referring to the left, the pasuk is explicit in saying so. This means that the word "kapo" or "kaf" on its own refers to the right hand.
 - **Q:** The pasuk regarding metzora is needed to teach for the metzora process, and can't be used to teach elsewhere!? **A:** The word "smalis" (left) is written a second time.
 - **Q:** Maybe say that an exclusion followed by an exclusion comes to *include*, and therefore two mentions of the left hand come to include that even the Kohen's right hand may be used for this as well? **A:** There is a third mention of "smalis", which can be used to teach elsewhere.
 - **Q:** Maybe the extra "smalis" teaches that every mention of "kaf" refers only to the left hand? **A:** There is a fourth mention of the word "smalis". This extra time teaches that all other mentions of "kaf" refer to the right hand.
 - **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked **R' Zeira**, why does the pasuk explicitly say (twice, once in regard to the wealthy metzora and once in regard to the poor metzora) that the oil of the metzora should be put on his right thumb and right big toe, when it already said that the oil should be put on the blood, which itself was already put on his right thumb and right big toe!? **A:** One of these pesukim is needed to teach that the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

sides of the thumbs are valid for putting of the oil, and one is needed to teach that the bottom of the thumbs are not valid.

- **Q:** What do the two pesukim (once in regard to the wealthy metzora and once in regard to the poor metzora) that say that the oil should be placed on the blood teach? **A:** One pasuk says “on the blood of the asham”. If we would only have had that, we would think that if the blood had already been wiped off the oil can no longer be applied there. Therefore we need the second pasuk of “on the place of the blood”. If we only had this second pasuk, we would have thought that the oil may only be applied if the blood had been wiped off, but if the blood was still there we would say that it acts as a chatzitza. We therefore also need the pasuk of “on the blood”.

-----Daf ׳---10-----

- **Rava** asked, since the pesukim clearly tell us that the oil of the metzora is to be placed “on the blood of the asham” and “on the place of the blood of the asham” and regarding the blood the pasuk teaches that it must be placed on the right thumb and toe, why do the pesukim regarding the metzora need to state that the oil should be placed on the right thumb and toe? **Rava** said, the 3 extra uses of the word “right” (regarding the ear, the thumb, and the toe) teach the following: the word right regarding the hand (the thumb) is used for a gezeira shava to teach that the hand used for kemitza must be the right hand, the word right regarding the foot (the toe) is used for a gezeira shava to teach that the foot used for chalitza must be the right foot, and the word right regarding the ear is used for a gezeira shava to teach that the ear used for “retzia” (the drilling of the ear of a Jewish slave who wants to stay beyond his 6 years) must be the right ear.
 - **Q:** What do the words “smalis” (the oil must be placed in the left palm of the Kohen) written twice regarding the wealthy metzora come to teach? **A: R’ Shisha the son of R’ Idi** said, this is needed to make the Kohen’s right hand passul with regard to receiving the oil of the metzora. If it wasn’t written twice here we would think that the left hand may *also* be used for this, but certainly the right hand may be used.
 - **Q:** What do the words “smalis” written twice regarding the poor metzora come to teach? **A:** This should be understood as in the Braisa taught by the yeshiva of **R’ Yishmael**, which says that sometimes an entire parsha is repeated for the sake of one new halacha (in this case, the entire parsha of the poor metzora was repeated to teach that the poor metzora may bring birds as his korbanos).
- **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of Reish Lakish** said, whenever a pasuk says “etzbah” and some form of the word “kehunah”, it refers to the right hand.
 - Initially, this was understood that both words are necessary to require that the right hand be used. However, regarding kemitza, only the verbiage of “kehuna” is used and yet a Mishna says that if it was done with the left hand it is passul!? Therefore, **Rava** explained that he meant *either* “etzbah” or “kehunah” would require that the avodah be done with the right hand.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, the pasuk regarding bringing the pieces of the animal to the ramp of the Mizbe’ach uses the word “Kohen”, and yet a Mishna says that it may be done with the left hand!? **A:** The word “etzbah” or “kehuna” only require using the right hand for an avodah that is essential to bring about the kapparah.
 - **Q:** Regarding kabbalah the pasuk says “Kohanim” and yet **R’ Shimon** says that it is valid if it was done with the left hand!? **A: R’ Shimon** holds that *both* words need to be written in the pasuk to make using the right hand absolutely essential.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R’ Shimon** holds that the word “yad” alone and the word “etzbah” alone refer to the right hand!? **A:** The word “etzbah” alone would require using the right hand. However, the word “kehuna” would only require the right hand when it is written along with the word “etzbah”, not by itself.
 - **Q:** If so, why is the word “kehuna” needed at all regarding kabbalah? **A:** It is to teach that the kabbalah must be done while wearing the bigdei kehunah.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Regarding the zrika the pasuk only uses the word “kehuna” and a Mishna says if it is done with the left hand it is passul, and **R’ Shimon** does not argue there!? **A: Abaye** said, **R’ Shimon** does argue on this halacha in a Braisa.
- **Q: Rava** teaches above that there is a gezeira shava on the word “yad” that teaches that kemitza must be done with the right hand. Now, the pasuk of kemitza uses the term kehunah, so why do we need a gezeira shava to teach that it must be done with the right hand? **A:** One is needed to teach that the kemitza must be done with the right hand, and the other is needed to teach that when it is then placed into a kli shareis to be made kodesh, it must also be done with the Kohen’s right hand.
 - **Q:** According to **R’ Shimon** who says that the kemitza does not need to be put into a kli shareis, and according to the view that says that he does, but that he would say that it is valid if done with the left hand, what does he learn from **Rava’s** gezeira shava? It can’t be coming to teach that the kemitza must be done with the right hand, because **R’ Yehuda the son of R’ Chiya** said that **R’ Shimon** learns that from a pasuk!? **A:** It is needed to teach that the kemitza of a *chatas* mincha must be done with the right hand. We would think that since he holds it is brought without oil and levonah it would also be valid if done with the left hand. The gezeira shava therefore teaches that it is passul if done with the left hand.

KAMATZ V’ALAH B’YADO TZROR OY GARGER MELACH...

- **Q:** The Mishna gives the examples of where there was a pebble, a grain of salt, or a piece of levonah in the kometz. Why are all three examples necessary? **A:** If we only had the example of the pebble, we would say that it makes it passul, because it is not something that is brought on the Mizbe’ach (but the others are brought on the Mizbe’ach). If we only had the example of salt, we would say that it makes it passul, because salt was never part of the mincha (only the kometz itself gets salted, whereas the levonah is placed into the kli shareis along with the entire mincha). The Mishna therefore also gave the example of levonah to teach that it is passul in that case as well.

-----Daf X’---11-----

MIPNEI SHE’AMRU HAKOMETZ HECHASER OY HAYASER PASSUL

- **Q:** Why does the Mishna say that the kometz is pasul because it has too much or too little? It should be passul because these foreign particles are a chatzitza in the mincha!? **A: R’ Yirmiya** said, the case is that the particle is on the side, in a way that it does not create a chatzitza between the pieces of flour or between the flour and the hand of the Kohen.
- **Abaye** asked **Rava**, how is kemitza done? **Rava** said, it is done how people normally scoop things in their hands – i.e. with all their fingers.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa calls the finger next to the pinkie the “kemitza”, because that is the first finger used during the kemitza, and the pinkie is not used. This refutes **Rava**!? **A: Rava** meant that all fingers are used, because the pinkie and the thumb are used to level off the flour that remains in the other fingers.
 - **Q:** How is the kemitza done? **A: R’ Zutra bar Tuvia in the name of Rav** said, the Kohen closes his three middle fingers until they reach his palm and then scoops up whatever is in them.
 - We see this in a Braisa as well. The Braisa says, one pasuk says “m’lo kumtzo”, which would suggest that an overflowing kometz should be taken. Another pasuk therefore says “b’kumtzo”, which teaches that a regular kometz must be taken. If the pasuk would only say “b’kumtzo”, we would think that even a small amount in the fingertips is enough to be taken. The pasuk of “m’lo kumtzo” teaches that a full kometz must be taken. The way this is done is by placing his hand, palm down, into the flour, closing the 3 middle fingers and using whatever is picked up in the process. With regard to a “machavas” and a “marcheshes” mincha, he smooths out whatever

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

sticks out of these 3 fingers with his thumb and pinkie. This is considered to be from the hardest Avodos of the Beis Hamikdash.

- **Q: R' Pappa** asked, what is the halacha if the Kohen did a complete kometz, but by using his fingertips? What if he did it from the sides? What if he did it from down to up? **A: TEIKU.**
- **Q: R' Pappa** asked, what is the halacha if the Kohen Gadol did the chafina with his fingertips? What if he did it from the sides? What if he did a handful in each hand separately and then brought them together? **A: TEIKU**
- **Q: R' Pappa** asked, what is the halacha if the Kohen sticks the kemitza to the side of the keili rather than place it in the bottom of the keili? **A: TEIKU.**
 - **Q: Mar bar R' Ashi** asked, what if the Kohen sticks the kometz to the bottom of the outside of the keili? **A: TEIKU.**

MISHNA

- How does he do it? He stretches out his fingers over the palm of his hand.
- If he put in too much of its oil or too little of its oil, or he put in too little of its levonah, it is passul.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is the case of putting in too much oil? **A: R' Elazar** said, it is where he designated 2 lug of oil for the mincha.
 - **Q:** Why can't he say that the case is where even a small amount of chullin oil or of oil of another mincha was mixed in? You can't say it is because these oils won't make the mincha passul, because if that is true, **R' Zutra bar Tuvia** said that we would never have a case of a chatas mincha becoming passul for putting oil into it (because it doesn't have its own oil)!? **A: R' Elazar** was teaching that certainly in the case of where oil of chullin of another korbon is brought, it will become passul. But, maybe you would say that if two lugim are designated for this korbon it does not become passul, since each lug could be used for that korbon. He therefore teaches that even in that case it would be passul.
 - **Q:** How does **R' Elazar** know that even where the extra oil is from extra oil that was designated for it, it becomes passul? **A:** He learned this from the words of the Mishna that say "too much of *its* oil", instead of simply saying "too much oil". These words teach that even if he designated two lugin for the mincha and put in that oil, it becomes passul.

CHISER LEVONASAH

- **Q:** One Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** says, if there is only one piece of levonah left it is passul, but if two remain it is valid. **R' Shimon** says, if there is one full piece left it is valid, but if it is less than one full piece it is passul. However, another Braisa says, if a kometz of levonah is missing the slightest amount it is passul!? **A:** We can change the second Braisa to say that if a *piece* of levonah is missing any amount it becomes passul (and would follow the view of **R' Shimon**). **A2:** The first Braisa is talking about levonah that is brought along with a mincha, and the second Braisa is talking about levonah that is brought by itself as a korbon.
- **R' Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan** said, there is a three-way machlokes regarding this. **R' Meir** holds that there must be a complete kometz of levonah when the kemitza is done, and there must be a full kometz of levonah when it is burned. **R' Yehuda** holds that there must be a complete kometz of levonah when the kemitza is done, and there must be at least two complete pieces of levonah when it is burned. **R' Shimon** holds that there must be a complete kometz of levonah when the kemitza is done, and there must be at least one complete piece of levonah when it is burned. They all darshen the same pasuk – "v'eis kol halevonah asher ahl hamincha". **R' Meir** says this teaches that the amount must remain as there was at the time of kemitza. **R' Yehuda** says that "kol" teaches that even one piece is enough and "eis" teaches that a second piece is needed. **R' Shimon** does not darshen the "eis".
 - **R' Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan** also said, the machlokes is only regarding levonah that is brought along with a korbon mincha. However, regarding levonah that is brought on its own, all agree that there must be a kometz in the beginning and a kometz at the time of burning. This is learned

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

from the pasuk when it says “asher ahl hamincha” – this is the halacha when it is brought along with a mincha, but not when it is brought on its own.

- **R’ Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R’ Yochanan** also said, the machlokes is only regarding levonah that is brought along with a korbon mincha. However, regarding levonah that is brought in the spoons on the Shulchan, all would agree that there must be two kematzin in the beginning and two kematzin at the time of burning.
 - **Q:** This seems obvious, because the word “kol” is not written regarding the spoons of levonah of the Shulchan!? **A:** We would have thought that since they are brought with the Lechem Hapanim, they are considered to be “asher ahl hamincha”. He therefore teaches that this is not so.
- There is a machlokes between **R’ Ami and R’ Yitzchak Nafcha** – one says that the machlokes is only regarding levonah that is brought along with a korbon mincha. However, regarding levonah that is brought on its own, all agree that there must be a kometz in the beginning and a kometz at the time of burning. The other says that the same machlokes exists in both cases.

CHISER LEVONASAH PESULAH

- **Q:** This suggests that if there is too much levonah it would still be valid. However, a Braisa says that if there is too much levonah it would be passul!? **A: Rami bar Chama** said, the Braisa is discussing where he designated two full kematzim of levonah (a full extra kometz) for the mincha. Our Mishna is discussing where is less than a full extra kometz.
 - **Rami bar Chama** also said, if he designated two kematzim of levonah for a mincha and one of them was lost before the kemitza, they are not established as part of the mincha and the mincha is therefore valid. However, if it was lost after the kemitza, it was already established as part of the mincha, and the mincha is therefore passul.
 - **Rami bar Chama** also said, if he designated four kematzim of levonah for the two spoons needed for the Shulchan (which should have been one kometz for each), and two kematzim became lost before the spoons were removed from the Shulchan, they are not established as part of the Lechem Hapanim and the Lechem Hapanim is therefore valid. However, if it was lost after the removal of the spoons, it was already established as part of the Lechem Hapanim, and it is therefore passul.
 - **Q:** Why is this case needed? It seems to be saying the same thing as the previous case!? **A:** We would think that since regarding the Lechem Hapanim the kometz is already determined (the spoonful is the kometz), once it reaches the time to remove them it becomes passul even if it had not yet been removed. He therefore teaches that this is not so.

-----Daf כ'---12-----

MISHNA

- If the Kohen does kemitza on a mincha with the intent to eat the leftover flour outside the Azarah, or to eat a kezayis of the leftover flour outside the Azarah, or to burn the kometz outside the Azarah, or to burn a kezayis of the kometz outside the Azarah, or to burn the levonah outside the Azarah, the mincha becomes passul but there is no kares. However, if he does the kemitza with intent to eat the leftover flour the next day, or a kezayis of it the next day, or to burn the kometz the next day, or a kezayis of the kometz the next day, or to burn the levonah the next day, it is piggul and one would be chayuv kares for eating it.
 - The general rule is, anyone who does the kemitza, or puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach, with an intent to eat something that is meant to be eaten or to burn something that is meant to be burned – if the intent is to do so beyond its proper place, it becomes passul but there is no kares for eating it; if the intent is to do so beyond its proper time, it becomes piggul and there is kares for eating it, as long as the “matir” (the kometz) is offered as it is supposed to be.
 - What is meant that the matir is offered as it is required to be? If he did the kemitza without saying anything (without a bad intent) and he then puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach with intent for beyond its time, or if he did the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

kemitza with intent for beyond its time and then puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach without any bad intent, or if he did the kemitza, puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach all with intent for beyond its time, this would be a case where the matir was offered as required.

- What is meant that the matir is not offered as it is required to be? If he did the kemitza with intent for beyond its allowable place and then puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach with intent for beyond its time, or if he did the kemitza with intent for beyond its allowable time and then puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach with intent for beyond its allowable place, or if he did the kemitza, puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach with intent for beyond its allowable place (while doing the other 3 with piggul intent), or in the case of a chatas mincha or sotah's mincha, if he did the kemitza not for its sake and then puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach with intent for beyond its time, or if he did the kemitza with intent for beyond its time and then puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach with intent not for its own sake, or if he did the kemitza, puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach not for its own sake, these would be cases of where the matir was not offered as it is required to be.
- If the Kohen intended to eat a kezayis beyond its allowable place and then intended to eat a kezayis beyond its time, or visa-versa, or he intended to eat a half of a kezayis beyond its allowable place and then intended to eat a half kezayis beyond its time, or visa-versa, the korbon will be passul, but there will not be kares if the korbon is then eaten. **R' Yehuda** says the general rule is, if the intent regarding beyond its time precedes the intent for beyond its allowable place, the korbon becomes piggul and there is kares. If the intent for beyond its allowable place precedes the intent for beyond its time, the korbon is passul and there is no kares. The **Chachomim** say, that in either case the korbon is passul and there is no kares.

GEMARA

- **Q:** According to the view that if the leftover flour (the "shirayim") becomes deficient between the taking of the kometz and the burning, the kometz is still burned, and we have established that this shirayim is assur to eat, what is the halacha regarding whether the burning of the kometz will be effective to establish the shirayim as piggul (e.g. if he had in mind to eat the shirayim after its proper time) and to remove them from being subject to me'ilah? **A: R' Huna** said, even according to **R' Akiva** who says that zrika is effective to remove me'ilah from a korbon that has left the Azarah, that is because it is still in existence and is only passul because of an external factor. However, regarding the shirayim that has become deficient, which is passul on its own account, the burning of the kometz will not be effective in removing the me'ila issur.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, we should say exactly the opposite! Even according to **R' Eliezer** who says that zrika does not help to remove me'ila from korbanos that have left the Azarah, that is only regarding korbanos that have left the Azarah, since they are not in the Azarah for the zrika to be effective on them. However, regarding the shirayim that has become deficient, which is inside the Azarah, the burning of the kometz should be effective to remove the issur of me'ila from it!? **Rava** said, I can prove this from our Mishna which said that if the Kohen does the kemitza to eat the shirayim outside the Azarah or a kezayis of the shirayim outside the Azarah, it is passul. **R' Chiya** taught a similar Braisa that left off the case of "or a kezayis". Now, why would he have left out that case? Presumably, it is because the case of the Braisa even includes where the shirayim was deficient to the point that there was only a kezayis left. Still, the Mishna says that in this case an improper intent would create piggul and would create a chiyuv kares. We see that the burning of the kometz can establish the shirayim as piggul and could therefore also remove me'ilah, even if the shirayim is deficient!? **A: Abaye** said, this is not the proper way to understand the Braisa. It may be that the Braisa follows the view of **R' Elazar**, who says in a Mishna that one is not chayuv for offering a kezayis of a kometz outside the Azarah. Rather, he would only be chayuv

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

if he offered the entire kometz outside the Azarah. Since, according to his view the Braisa could not have given the case of “or a kezayis of the kometz outside”, it also did not give the case of a kezayis of the shirayim.

- **Q:** The Braisa can't follow **R' Elazar**, because he says in a Mishna that the burning of the kometz without the levonah is not valid, and the Braisa gives the case of the burning of the kometz alone!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to the kometz of the chatas mincha, which does not have levonah brought with it. In fact, we find that **R' Dimi in the name of the Amora R' Elazar** also said that the Braisa is referring to the kometz of the chatas mincha and follows the view of the Tanna **R' Elazar**.
- **Rava** later retracted what he said (rather, the burning of the kometz on the Mizbe'ach will not effect shirayim that have become deficient). He based this on a Braisa which he said must follow **R' Akiva** and implies that a kometz of a mincha has no effect on shirayim that is deficient. **Abaye** said, the Braisa can be understood as following the view of **R' Eliezer**, and that is why the kometz has no effect on shirayim that is deficient. However, it may be that according to **R' Akiva** the kometz would have an effect on shirayim that is deficient.

MISHNA

- If the Kohen intended to eat half of a kezayis of the shirayim the next day and to burn half a kezayis of the kometz the next day, the mincha is valid, because an intent for eating and for burning do not combine to create the minimum required amount of a kezayis.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna suggests that the reason the two intents don't combine is that one intent was for eating and the other was for burning. However, in the similar case of eating a half kezayis of something that is meant to be eaten and eating another half kezayis of something that is not meant to be eaten it would combine. Now, the earlier part of the Mishna specifically said that the intent only makes it passul when he intends something that is meant to be eaten or burns something that is meant to be burned!? **A: R' Yirmiya** said, this later part of the Mishna is the view of **R' Eliezer**, who argues on the **Rabanan** in a Mishna and says that when an intent is made to eat something that is meant to be burned, or to burn something that is meant to be eaten, beyond its place or time, it does make the korbon passul. **A2: Abaye** says that this later part of the Mishna can even be following the view of the **Rabanan**, and the inference from the Mishna is not that an intent to eat something that is not meant to be eaten combines, but rather that if he intends to eat half of a kezayis and then another half of a kezayis of something that is meant to be eaten, they combine.
 - **Q:** According to **Abaye**, what is the chiddush? The earlier parts of the Mishna teach that intents to eat things that are meant to be eaten combine, and we can also learn from there that if only things that are meant to be eaten combine, certainly intents for eating and burning do not combine, so what is this part of the Mishna coming to teach? **A:** The Mishna is teaching that intents for eating and burning do not combine. We would not be able to learn this from the fact that intents for eating something that is meant to be eaten and to eat something that is not meant to be eaten do not combine, because we would say that those don't combine because it involves an intent to do something that is not the normal way of doing it. However, an intent to eat something that is meant to be eaten and an intent to burn something that is meant to be burned should combine because they are both an intent to do something that is meant to be done. Therefore, the Mishna needs to teach that these intents also do not combine.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL HAMENACHOS!!!