



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Menachos, Daf ל"ג – Daf ט"ו

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 ל"ג-----13-----

PEREK HAKOMETZ ES HAMINCHA -- PEREK SHEINI

MISHNA

- If a Kohen does the kemitza with intent to eat the shirayim or to burn the kometz the next day, **R' Yose** would agree that the korbon becomes piggul and there is a chiyuv kares for someone who eats it. If the kemitza is done with intent to burn the levonah the next day, **R' Yose** says it is passul but there is no kares, and the **Chachomim** say it is passul and there is kares. The **Chachomim** said to him, why is this different than an animal korbon (where if the animal is shechted with intent to burn the eimurim the next day, the korbon would certainly become piggul and one would be chayuv kares)? The same should be with the mincha!? **R' Yose** said, the difference is that the blood, meat, and eimurim are all considered to be one thing, whereas the levonah is not considered to be part of the mincha.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why did the Mishna need to say the first case and say that in that case **R' Yose** agrees? **A:** If we would only give the second case where he says it is passul and there is no kares, we would say that **R' Yose's** reasoning is based on that he holds that an intent on half of the matir cannot create piggul. Therefore, we would say that in the first case as well it would not become piggul, because it is also regarding half a matir (since the intent did not include the levonah). The Mishna therefore teaches that in the first case he agrees that it becomes full piggul.

L'HAKTIR LEVONASAH L'MACHAR R' YOSE OMER PASSUL V'EIN BO KARES

- **Reish Lakish** said, **R' Yose** would say that one matir cannot effect piggul on another matir (e.g. an intent on the levonah during the kemitza of the kometz will not make it piggul). The same should be said regarding the two spoons of levonah on the Shulchan (they are both matirin).
 - **Q:** Why is it necessary to state that the same applies to the two spoons of levonah? **A:** We would have thought to say that **R' Yose** holds the way he does when there is an intent on the levonah during the avodah on the kometz, because the kometz and the levonah are of different kinds. However, regarding the two spoons of levonah, where they are both of the same kind, maybe they can effect piggul on each other. **Reish Lakish** therefore teaches that they do not.
 - **Q:** The Mishna suggests that **R' Yose's** view is based on the fact that the levonah and the kometz are of different kinds, because **R' Yose** explains that the mincha is different than the blood, meat, and eimurim of an animal, because those different parts of the animal are considered to be one thing, whereas the levonah is not the same as the mincha itself!? **A:** What **R' Yose** means when he says this is that the levonah is not subject to the same restrictions as the mincha. As long as the kometz is not burned, the shirayim may not be eaten. However, even if the kometz is not burned, the levonah may still be burned.
 - The **Rabanan** argue and hold that we only say that a matir can't effect piggul on another matir when the two are not placed into a single kli shareis. The mincha and the levonah are put into a single kli shareis and therefore they are considered to be one and the same.
- **R' Yannai** said, if the levonah was gathered by a non-Kohen, it is passul.
 - **R' Yirmiya** explained this is because he has moved the levonah closer to the Mizbe'ach and he has therefore done holacha. This would be considered a holacha, because **R' Yannai** holds that holacha does not need to involve movement of the feet and holacha done by a non-Kohen is passul.
 - **R' Mari** said, we can see this from our Mishna as well. The Mishna says that the kemitza, putting it into a keili, carrying it to the Mizbe'ach, and burning it are all avodos. Now, the kemitza is like a shechita. The

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

carrying it is like holacha. The burning it is like the zrika. What avodah is the putting it into a keili? It is not like kabbalah, because the blood flows into a keili on its own, whereas the flour must be put into the keili! Rather, we must say that since this must be done, it is an important avodah, and therefore it must be considered like a kabbalah. Similarly, with regard to gathering the levonah, we must say that since this must be done, it is an important avodah, and therefore it must be considered like a holacha.

- The Gemara says this is no proof. Putting the flour into the keili is like kabbalah. The fact that kabbalah of blood is different because it happens on its own does not make a difference, and therefore the putting of the flour into the keili is a true kabbalah. However, gathering the levonah is not similar to holacha, and would therefore not be considered a holacha.

MISHNA

- If the two lambs that accompany the Shte Halechem on Shavuos were shechted with intent to eat one of the challos the next day, or if one burned the levonah of the Shulchan with intent to eat one of the arrangements of the Lechem Hapanim on the next day, **R' Yose** says, that challah or that arrangement which was the subject of the intent is piggul and there is a chiyuv kares and the other one is passul but does not carry kares. The **Chachomim** say that both of them are piggul and carry kares.

GEMARA

- **R' Huna** said, **R' Yose** would say that if there was piggul intent regarding the right thigh of an animal, the left thigh does not become piggul. We can say this is based on logic – just as if one thigh became tamei, the other would not become tamei (when they have been separated), so the same is with regard to piggul. We can also say that this is based on a pasuk that says “*v'hanelesh ha'oches mimenu avono tisah*” – piggul is for the one who eats *it*, but not for the other limb.
 - **Q: R' Nachman** asked **R' Huna**, a Braisa says that there is only piggul on the second challah of the Shte Halechem if there was intent regarding *both* challos, even if there was intent to eat a combined kezayis of the two of them beyond their time. This implies that if there was only intent regarding one of the them, the other would not become piggul. Who does this Braisa follow? It can't be the **Rabanan**, because they say that intent regarding only one of them makes the other passul! Rather, it must follow **R' Yose**. Now, if we say that the limbs of an animal are considered to be one unit, it would make sense to say that the two challos are also considered to be one unit. However, if you say that even the limbs are not one unit, how can we say that the two challos are considered to be one unit!? **A:** The Braisa follows the view of **Rebbi** in a Braisa. The Braisa says, if one shechts the first lamb with intent to eat half a kezayis of one challah beyond its time, and shechts the second lamb with intent to eat half a kezayis of the other challah beyond its time, **Rebbi** says that it would be valid. This suggests that this is because he said “half a kezayis”. However, had he said “a kezayis from both challos” it would have combined for piggul. Based on this, the previous Braisa can be following this view of **Rebbi**.

-----Daf 7'---14-----

- The Gemara continues its discussion.
 - **Q:** How can you say the Braisa follows the view of **Rebbi**? Whose view of our Mishna did **Rebbi** follow? If he follows the **Rabanan**, then even an intent regarding eating a kezayis of one of the challos creates piggul!? If he follows **R' Yose**, who says that piggul intent regarding one thigh does not make the other thigh piggul, then how could he say that a piggul intent regarding a kezayis of the two challos together makes them piggul!? **A:** Rather, the Braisa follows the view of the **Rabanan**. The Braisa does not mean that it does not become piggul until there is intent on both of the challos, rather it means that there must be a piggul intent regarding both of the lambs. This comes to exclude the view of **R' Meir**, who says that piggul can be created from an intent on half of a matir (the two lambs together are a matir).
 - **Q:** If so, what does the Braisa mean when it says that piggul is “never” created unless there is an intent regarding both of them? Now, if we say that the Braisa means that the piggul intent must

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

be regarding both challos and both lambs, and it follows the view of **R' Yose** (who says that intent regarding one challah does not make the other one piggul), we can say that this comes to exclude the view of **R' Meir** (that intent on one lamb suffices) and the view of the **Rabanan** (that the intent on one challah suffices). However, if the Braisa follows the view of the **Rabanan** and only comes to exclude the view of **R' Meir**, what is meant by “never”? If so, we are back to the original question – if **R' Yose** holds, as **R' Huna** said, that piggul intent regarding one thigh does not make the other one piggul, how can he say that a kezayis of the two challos together can create piggul!? Also, **R' Ashi** said, a Braisa says, **Rebbi in the name of R' Yose** said, if (regarding the korbanos that are offered on the inside Mizbe'ach) he had a piggul intent regarding something that is done outside the Heichal, it becomes piggul. If he had an intent regarding something that is done inside the heichal, it is not piggul. For example, if he was standing outside the Heichal and said that he is shechting with intent to apply the blood beyond its time, it is not piggul, because this is an intent outside regarding something done inside. If he was standing inside and said that he is applying the blood with the intent to offer the eimurim or pour the leftover blood the next day, it is also not piggul, because this is an intent inside regarding something to be done outside. However, if he was standing outside and shechted with intent to pour the leftover blood the next day or to offer the eimurim the next day, it would be piggul because it is an intent had outside regarding something done on the outside. Now, with regard to the intent to pour the leftover blood the next day, what will it cause to become piggul? It can't be the blood (meaning that a person who eats the blood will be chayuv kares) because a Mishna says that blood cannot become piggul! Rather, it means that it makes the meat piggul. Now, if when having intent on the blood **R' Yose** holds that it makes the meat piggul, surely if he has an intent on one thigh it would make the other thigh piggul!? Furthermore, **Ravina** said, the Mishna says, if the Kohen takes the kemitza with intent to eat the shirayim or to burn the kometz the next day, **R' Yose** agrees that it is piggul and there is a chiyuv kares on it. Now, what does the intent to burn the kometz the next day make piggul? It can't mean that it makes the kometz piggul, because a Mishna says that a kometz cannot become piggul. Rather, it means that the shirayim become piggul. Now, if in the case where he did not have an intent about the shirayim itself, **R' Yose** says it becomes piggul, then in the case where he had piggul intent regarding the meat itself (one thigh) it certainly makes all of the meat (even the other thigh) piggul!? **A:** Rather, **R' Yochanan** said, that the reason for the view of **R' Yose** is that the pasuk treats the two challos as one unit and the pasuk also treats them as two units – they are considered as one unit in the sense that they are essential to each other and one can't be brought without the other, and they are considered as two units in that they are prepared separately. Therefore, if a person combined them in his intent, they are treated as one, but if he separated them they are considered to be separate.

- **Q: R' Yochanan** asked, what if one had a piggul intent for one set of the Todah breads? Do the other sets become piggul as well? What if one had piggul intent for one category of breads of a baked mincha? **A: R' Tachlifa** of EY taught a Braisa that in these cases there is the same machlokes between **R' Yose and the Rabanan**.
- A Braisa says, if during shechita he intends to eat a half kezayis beyond its time and during the zrika he has a similar intent, it is piggul, because shechita and zrika combine.
 - Some say that this is only true for shechita and zrika, since they are both matirin, but would not be true for kabbalah and holacha. Others say that if shechita and zrika, which are far apart (they are the first and last of the Avodos) combine, then certainly kabbalah and holacha will combine.
 - **Q: Levi** taught a Braisa that said that none of the Avodos can combine to make piggul!? **A: Rava** said, the Braisa that says they can't be combined follows **Rebbi** and the Braisa that says that they can be combined follows the **Rabanan**. We see this in the Braisa where **Rebbi** says that if there is intent during the shechita of each lamb to eat half a kezayis of one of the challos beyond their time, it is a valid korban. We see that he holds that they don't combine for piggul.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Abaye** asked, maybe **Rebbi** holds that way there, because the intent involves half of a matir (one lamb) and half of the amount necessary to be eaten. However, if the intent to eat half the amount was made during an entire matir he may say that it does combine!?
 - **Q: Rava bar R' Chanan** asked **Abaye**, if **Rebbi** holds that when there is an entire matir it does combine, then in the case of the half matir he should be goizer that it should be passul out of concern for the case of where it was a complete matir!? We find that **R' Yose** makes such a gezeira and the **Rabanan** make such a gezeira!? **A: Abaye** said, **R' Yose and the Rabanan** are goizer in cases where there is a specific similar case that necessitates us to be goizer. However, the case of **Rebbi** does not require us to be goizer, because there will never be a case where one of the lambs will act as the entire matir, and therefore there will never be a similar case of actual piggul.

-----Daf 10---15-----

MISHNA

- If one of the two challos of the Shte Halechem or one of the two arrangements of the Lechem Hapanim became tamei, **R' Yehuda** says both challos or arrangements must be taken out to be burned, because a korbon of the tzibbur is not divided. The **Chachomim** say that the tamei one is tamei and the tahor one may be eaten.

GEMARA

- **R' Elazar** said, the machlokes is where they became tamei before the zrika (of the animals, or the burning of the levonah). However, if they became tamei afterwards, all would agree that the tamei one is tamei and the tahor one may be eaten.
 - **Q:** What is the point of machlokes in the case where it became tamei before the zrika? **A: R' Pappa** said, the machlokes is whether the tzitz brings acceptance for the parts of a korbon that are eaten – the **Rabanan** say that it does and **R' Yehuda** says that it does not.
 - **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Nosson** asked **R' Pappa**, we see from a Braisa that they even argue regarding the parts of the korbon that are burned on the Mizbe'ach, so that cannot be the basis of their machlokes!? Further, **R' Ashi** said, a Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says that if even one Shevet is tamei, they may all bring the Korbon Pesach in tumah, because a korbon of the tzibbur is not divided. Now this has nothing to do with the tzitz providing acceptance, and yet he says his ruling. We see that his ruling has nothing to do with the tzitz!? Further, **Ravina** said, if the reason of **R' Yehuda** is based on the tzitz, he should give that as his reason in our Mishna!? **A:** Rather, **R' Yochanan** said, it is an established ruling of **R' Yehuda** that the korbon of the tzibbur is not divided.

MISHNA

- A piggul intent regarding a Korbon Todah makes the breads piggul, but a piggul intent regarding the breads does not make the todah piggul. How so? If he shechted the todah with intent to eat it the next day, both the korbon and the breads become piggul. However, if he shechted with intent to eat the breads the next day, the breads become piggul, but the todah does not.
- A piggul intent regarding the lambs of the Shte Halechem makes the breads piggul, but a piggul intent regarding the breads does not make the lambs piggul. How so? If he shechted the lambs with intent to eat it the next day, both the lambs and the breads become piggul. However, if he shechted with intent to eat the breads the next day, the breads become piggul, but the lambs does not.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why does piggul intent regarding the todah make the breads piggul? It can't be based on the statement of **R' Kahana** which said that the pasuk refers to the breads as a "todah" as well, because if that is the reason, then a

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

piggul intent regarding the breads should make the todah piggul as well!? **A:** That is not problematic, because the breads are referred to as a todah, but the todah is not referred to as breads.

- **Q:** The Mishna says that piggul intent regarding the lambs of the Shte Halechem makes the breads piggul, but a piggul intent regarding the breads does not make the lambs piggul. Now, we don't find anywhere that the breads are referred to as "lambs" and yet they cause the breads to become piggul!? **A:** Rather, the reason for this "one-way" relationship is that the breads are an accessory for the todah and for the lambs, which is why they become piggul along with the korbon, but the reverse is not true.
- The reason the Mishna had to give both cases is, that if we would have only said the case of the todah we would have said that it is only in that case that the breads don't make the korbon piggul, because they never become connected with a tenufah. However, the Shte Halechem and the lambs have a tenufah done together, and we would think that because of this even an intent on the breads would make the lambs piggul. That is why the Mishna gives this case as well.
- **Q: R' Elazar** asked **Rav**, what is the halacha if one shechted a todah with intent to eat a combined kezayis of the korbon and the bread the next day? Clearly the korbon will not become piggul, but will the breads become piggul? **A: Rav** said, in this case as well the breads become piggul and the korbon does not.
 - **Q:** We should say a kal v'chomer – if the thing that is making the piggul (the korbon) does not itself become piggul, then the thing that cannot make piggul (the breads cannot make the korbon piggul) should surely not become piggul!? **A:** We don't make such a kal v'chomer, as can be seen in a Braisa which says: it once happened that a person planted seeds of another species in the vineyard of his friend and the **Rabanan** said that the seeds are assur but the grapes remain mutar. Now, why don't we say a kal v'chomer that if the grapes which are making the seeds assur don't become assur, then the seeds which are not making anything assur should surely not become assur! We see that we don't make such a kal v'chomer.
 - **Q:** This is not a valid answer! Those seeds are only assur D'Rabanan and therefore the **Rabanan** made only the seeds assur to penalize the one who did the improper act. However, in our case we should say the kal v'chomer!?
 - There is another version that taught that **R' Elazar** asked this question and had the conversation that followed, all in regard to where the lambs were shechted with intent to eat a combined kezayis of the korbon and the bread the next day.
 - The Gemara says, the first version would agree that the same question applies regarding the lambs and the breads. The second version would say that it is only a question regarding the lambs and the breads, because they are combined as one unit for the tenufah.
 - **R' Abba Zuti** said, the question **R' Elazar** asked was, what if he shechted the lamb with intent to eat "its friend" the next day? Do we say that "its friend" refers to the other lamb and it therefore will not become piggul, or do we say it refers to the breads and it therefore will make the bread piggul? **Rav** answered, a Mishna clearly says that if he shechted the lamb with intent to eat "its friend" the next day, neither of them become piggul. **R' Elazar** said, the case of the Mishna may be that he intended for "its friend the other lamb", and not just "its friend".

MISHNA

- A piggul intent regarding a korbon will make the accompanying nesachim into piggul once they have been made kadosh in a keili. This is the view of **R' Meir**. However, a piggul intent regarding the nesachim will not make the korbon into piggul. How so? If he shechted the korbon with intent to eat the korbon the next day, the korbon and the nesachim become piggul. If he had the intent to offer the nesachim the next day, the nesachim would become piggul, but the korbon would not.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, with regard to nesachim brought along with an animal korbon one can be chayuv kares for piggul, because the blood of the korbon is matir the nesachim to be offered on the Mizbe'ach. This is the view of **R' Meir**. The **Chachomim** said to him, a person may even bring the nesachim for a korbon 10 days after the korbon

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

is brought!? **R' Meir** said, I only stated my opinion regarding nesachim that are brought at the same time as the korbon. They said to him, the nesachim may be used for another korbon (which again shows that it is not so connected to the korbon that it should be able to be made piggul by it)!? **Rava** explained, that **R' Meir** holds that once the korbon is shechted the nesachim may not be used for another korbon.

- A Braisa says, one can be chayuv kares for the oil of a metzora that became piggul, because the zrika of the blood of the asham is matir the oil to be applied to the metzora. This is the view of **R' Meir**. The **Chachomim** said to him, a person may even bring the oil 10 days after the korbon is brought!? **R' Meir** said, I only stated my opinion regarding oil that is brought at the same time as the korbon. They said to him, the oil may be used for another korbon (which again shows that it is not so connected to the korbon that it should be able to be made piggul by it)!? **Rava** explained, that **R' Meir** holds that once the korbon is shechted the oil may not be used for another korbon.

-----Daf 10---16-----

- The “sharp ones of Pumbedisa” said, the burning of the kometz can effect piggul in the burning of the levonah (if during the burning of the kometz the Kohen intended to burn the levonah the next day, it makes it piggul). Even according to the **Rabanan** who say that piggul can't be created with only half a matir, that is only when while burning the kometz he intended to eat the shirayim the next day. However, when the intent was regarding the levonah it is considered to have been done during the entire matir and it does become piggul.
 - **Rava** said, we can prove this from the earlier Mishna which said that 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. Now, presumably just as an intent during the kemitza, putting into a keili, or bringing to the Mizbe'ach creates piggul whether the intent was to eat the shirayim beyond its time or to burn the levonah beyond its time, the same is true for such intent during the burning of the kometz!
 - The Gemara says, this is not a valid proof. It may be that during the other 3 avodos, an intent regarding eating or burning would create piggul, but during the burning, it may be that only an intent regarding the eating of the shirayim would create piggul.
 - **R' Menashyeh bar Gada** said to **Abaye** in the name of **R' Chisda**, the burning of the kometz cannot effect piggul in the burning of the levonah. Even according to **R' Meir** who says that piggul can be created with only half a matir, that is only when while burning the kometz he intended to eat the shirayim the next day, because the kometz is its matir. However, when the intent was regarding the levonah, since the kometz is not its matir, it will not create piggul. **Abaye** asked him, did he say this in the name of **Rav**? **R' Menashyeh** said, that he in fact did. We find elsewhere as well, that **R' Chisda** had said this in the name of **Rav**.
 - **R' Yaakov bar Idi in the name of Abaye** said, we can bring a proof to this from the Mishna, which said that if he shechted one of the Shavuot lambs with intent to eat the other lamb the next day, they remain valid. Presumably, this is because one lamb is not the matir of the other, and that is why it cannot make it piggul!
 - The Gemara says, this is not a valid proof. It may be that in that case it cannot create piggul, because the two lambs are never put into one keili. However, the kometz and the levonah are put into the same keili, which establishes them as one, and that may be why the intent during the kometz can effect the levonah.
 - **R' Hamnuna** said that **R' Chanina** taught him, if a Kohen burns the kometz with intent to burn the levonah the next day and to eat the shirayim the next day, it becomes piggul.
 - **Q:** What is he teaching? If he is teaching that the burning of the kometz can effect piggul in the burning of the levonah, then let him just give that case!? If he is teaching that there is piggul even with only half a matir, then let him only give the case of intent to eat the shirayim the next

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

day!? If he meant to teach both things, then he should give both cases (as he did), but should say that he had this intent **or** that intent, why the need to say that he had both? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** said, in truth he holds that the burning of the kometz cannot effect piggul in the burning of the levonah, and he holds that intent during half a matir cannot make piggul. The reason why it becomes piggul in this case is because he ultimately had intent regarding all parts of the mincha.

- A Braisa was taught in front of **R' Yitzchak bar Abba** that said, if one burned the kometz with intent to eat the shirayim the next day, all agree that it becomes piggul. He asked, we have learned that it is a machlokes between **R' Meir and the Rabanan!**? Rather, say that the Braisa says that all agree that the korbon is passul (they argue whether it is full piggul).
 - **Q:** Why didn't he instead say that the Braisa says it is piggul and only follows the view of **R' Meir**? **A:** The Braisa was taught as saying that all agree. It is more likely that a mistake was made between "passul" and "piggul" than to say that there was a mistake made between "all agree" and "this is only the view of **R' Meir**".

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HAKOMETZ ES HAMINCHA!!!

PEREK HAKOMETZ RABBAH -- PEREK SHLISHI

MISHNA

- If a Kohen does the kemitza with intent to eat something that is not meant to be eaten or to burn something that is not meant to be burned, in either case beyond its allowable place or time, the korbon remains valid. **R' Eliezer** says the korbon is passul.
 - If the intent was to eat something that is meant to be eaten or to burn something that is meant to be burned beyond its place or time, but the intent was regarding less than a kezayis, the korbon is valid.
 - If the intent was to eat half a kezayis of the shirayim and to burn half a kezayis of the kometz or levona beyond its place or time, the korbon is valid, because eating and burning don't combine.

GEMARA

- **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the reason of **R' Eliezer** is based on the pasuk of "v'ihm hei'achol yei'acheil", which suggests there are "two eatings" – one of people and one of the Mizbe'ach – and teaches that intent to put onto the Mizbe'ach something meant to be eaten by people, or visa-versa, can create piggul. This drasha is based on the fact that the Torah refers to the burning on the Mizbe'ach as "eating". The **Rabanan** (who argue on **R' Eliezer**) say that the reason the Torah refers to the burning as eating is to either teach that if the intent to burn was formulated using verbiage of "eating" it can still create piggul, or to teach that just as eating must be at least the size of a kezayis, the same is true for burning on the Mizbe'ach. **R' Eliezer** says, to teach that, the pasuk's double verbiage should have used the same word twice. The fact that it changed words teaches a second drasha (the one he darshened above).
 - **R' Zeira** asked **R' Assi**, if **R' Eliezer's** opinion is based on a pasuk, he should even say that there is a chiyuv kares for this!? Yet, you have said in the name of **R' Yochanan** that **R' Eliezer** agrees that there is no kares!? **R' Assi** said, there is a machlokes Tanna'im whether **R' Eliezer** holds this is D'Oraisa, in which case there would be kares, or if he holds it is only D'Rabanan, in which case there would not be kares. In fact, we can prove this from a Braisa. The Braisa says, if someone shechts a korbon with intent to drink the blood the next day, or to burn the meat on the Mizbe'ach the next day, or to eat the eimurim the next day, the korbon is valid. **R' Eliezer** says it is passul. If he intends to leave the blood over until the next day, **R' Yehuda** says the korbon is passul. **R' Elazar** said, in this case also **R' Eliezer** will say that it is passul and the **Chachomim** will say that it is valid. Now, whose view is **R' Yehuda** following? He can't be following the **Rabanan**, because if they say that when the person says it will be consumed the next day it is valid, then surely if he just says that it will be left over to the next day it will certainly be valid! Rather, he must be following the view of **R' Eliezer**. If so, when **R' Elazar** says that in this case also **R' Eliezer** will

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

say that it is passul and the **Chachomim** will say that it is valid, **R' Elazar** is saying the exact same thing as **R' Yehuda**! Rather, we must say that they argue as to whether or not there is kares – **R' Yehuda** is saying that there will be kares in the first case and **R' Elazar** is saying that there will not be kares in either case. We see that there is a machlokes whether **R' Eliezer** holds there is kares when the intention was to eat something that was meant to be burned, or visa-versa.

- The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. It may be that all agree that there would not be kares in that first case, and there is actually a 3-way machlokes in the Braisa: the **T"K** holds that **R' Eliezer and the Rabanan** only argue in the first case, but in the case of intent to leave over the blood all would agree that the korbon is valid, **R' Yehuda** says that in the case of intent to leave over the blood all would agree that the korbon is passul as a gezeira for a case when all the blood is left over to the next day, which a Braisa teaches would actually be passul D'Oraisa, and **R' Elazar** holds that even in the case of intent to leave over the blood the **Rabanan and R' Eliezer** argue.

-----Daf 17-----

- **Q:** The Gemara just said that **R' Yehuda** holds that if one brings a korbon with intent to leave over some of the blood for the next day, all would agree (the **Rabanan and R' Eliezer**) that it would be passul. The Gemara asks, from the conversation between **R' Elazar ben Shamu'ah** and **Yosef Habavli** in a Braisa we can learn that **R' Yehuda** told **Yosef Habavli** that it is actually a machlokes between the **Rabanan and R' Eliezer** in the case of intent to leave the blood over until the next day!? **A:** The Gemara says that the Braisa can be understood even if **R' Yehuda** holds that all would agree in that case.

MISHNA

- If the Kohen did not pour the oil onto the mincha (after having already placed oil into the keili before placing the flour into it, and after having then poured more oil onto the flour and mixed it, he did not do the 3rd pouring of oil onto the already mixed mincha), or if he did not mix the oil with the mincha (i.e. the second pouring of oil), or if he did not break any of the baked menachos into pieces (but rather only broke enough to allow him to take a kometz), or if he did not salt the mincha before burning it, or if he did not do tenufa, or did not bring it to the southwest corner of the Mizbe'ach ("hagasha"), or if he broke the mincha into pieces that are larger than how they are supposed to be broken, or if he did not smear oil on the mincha (if it is of the type of mincha that is supposed to have that done, e.g. rekikin), the mincha is valid.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What does the Mishna mean that he did not pour oil onto the mincha? If it means that it was not poured at all, it would be passul, because that is essential to the korbon!? **A:** Rather, it means that the pouring was done by a non-Kohen.
 - **Q:** If so, when the Mishna lists the case of the mincha which was not mixed with oil it must also refer to the case of where it was mixed by a non-Kohen. This would suggest that if the mincha was not mixed at all it would be passul. However, a Mishna suggests that as long as a mincha could be mixed it is valid even if it was not mixed!? **A:** Each part of the Mishna refers to a different set of circumstances. The part discussing the pouring of the oil refers to where it was done by a non-Kohen (and that is where the Mishna says it is valid) and the part that discusses mixing refers to where it was not mixed at all (and the Mishna teaches that even there it is valid).

OY SHEPSASAN PITIM MERUBOS K'SHEIRA

- **Q:** The Mishna has already said that if he did not break the mincha at all it is valid, so why did it have to teach that if he broke it into pieces that are larger, they are valid? **A:** The Mishna doesn't mean that he broke it into large pieces, rather it means that he broke it into many more pieces than he should have (so that each piece is smaller than it should have been). **A2:** The Mishna means that he broke them into pieces that were larger than they should have been. However, we would have thought that when he doesn't break them at all the korbon is

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

valid because they have the status of “challos”, but when they are broken into the wrong size they don’t have the status of “challos” or of “psitim” and should therefore be passul.

- **Q:** Our Mishna seems not to follow **R’ Shimon**, who lists in a Braisa the avodos that must be done by a Kohen, and includes the pouring of the oil in that list!? **A: R’ Nachman** said, the Braisa is referring to the mincha of a Kohen and the Mishna is referring to the mincha of a non-Kohen. The mincha of a non-Kohen has kemitza done, and it is from the kemitza and forward that a Kohen is required, which means that a Kohen is not required for the pouring and the mixing. The mincha of a Kohen does not have kemitza done, and it is therefore from the very beginning (even for pouring and mixing) that a Kohen is required.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, we learn that a Kohen’s mincha requires pouring of the oil onto it from the fact that a non-Kohen’s mincha requires that. If so, we should say that just as the mincha of non-Kohen can have the pouring done by a non-Kohen, the pouring for the mincha of a Kohen should also be able to be done by a non-Kohen!? If so, when **R’ Shimon** says it must be done by a Kohen, he would refer even to the mincha of a non-Kohen and must argue with our Mishna!? **A:** We must say that **R’ Shimon** argues with our Mishna.

-----Daf 19-----

- The Gemara just said that our Mishna (the **Rabanan**) holds that the pouring of the oil may even be done by a non-Kohen, and **R’ Shimon** says it may only be done by a Kohen.
 - **Q:** What is the reasoning of the **Rabanan**? **A:** The pasuk says that oil should be poured on it and levonah should be put on it and it should be brought to the Bnei Aharon the Kohanim and he should take the kometz. This teaches that from the kemitza and forward it must be done by a Kohen, but the mixing and pouring of the oil is even valid when done by a non-Kohen.
 - **Q:** What is the reasoning of **R’ Shimon**? **A:** The pasuk says “Bnei Aharon Hakohanim”, but is darshened as teaching regarding the part earlier (the pouring) and the part after (the kemitza).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, we darshen the pasuk that says “b’etzba’oh” and “v’lakach” to teach that just as the “etzbah” refers to the finger on his right hand, so too the kabbalah must be done with his right hand. The pasuk also says “v’nossan”, which teaches that the putting of the blood on the Mizbe’ach must also be done with the right hand. **R’ Shimon** said, the pasuk doesn’t say “yad” regarding kabbalah. Rather, it only says “etzba’oh” and “v’nossan”, which teaches that the putting of the blood must be done with the right hand. However, since it doesn’t say “yad” regarding kabbalah, it is even valid if done with the left hand. **Abaye** explains that the machlokes is based on whether we say that we darshen a pasuk as referring to earlier or to later. From here we see that **R’ Shimon** does not say that it is darshened both ways!? **A:** Rather, the reason of **R’ Shimon** is based on the word “vehevi’a” (and he shall bring to the Kohen). This “vuv” connects this to the previous and teaches that just as the kemitza must be done by a Kohen the pouring must be done by a Kohen as well.
 - **Q:** If **R’ Shimon** holds this way he should similarly darshen the pasuk of “v’shachat es ben habakar...vihikrivu” to teach that just as the kabbalah must be done by a Kohen, the “vuv” should teach that the shechita must be done by a Kohen as well!? **A:** The matter of shechita is different, because there is a hekesh of “v’samach” to “v’shachat” which teaches that just as the semicha is done by a non-Kohen, the shechita may also be done by a non-Kohen.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should say that just as the semicha must be done by the owner, the shechita must be done by the owner as well? **A:** We would not say that, based on a kal v’chomer – if zrika, which is the main part of the kapparah, does not have to be done by the owner, then the shechita certainly does not have to be done by the owner. If you will ask that this can’t be learned from zrika, because zrika must be done by a Kohen, we can say that we learn from Yom Kippur, where the pasuk teaches that the Kohen Gadol must shecht his korbon,

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

that it is only there that the owner must shecht his korban, but other korbanos do not need to be shechted by their owner.

- **Rav** said, whenever the Torah says the words “torah” and “chukah” it comes to teach that that halacha is essential. The Gemara initially understands this to mean that in order to teach that it is essential, both these words must be written, for example as it is written in the pasuk of “zos chukas hatarah”.
 - **Q:** Regarding nazir the pasuk only says “torah” and yet **Rav** says that tenufa is essential!? **A:** The pasuk there says “kein yaaseh”, which teaches that it is essential.
 - **Q:** Regarding todah the pasuk only says “torah” and yet a Mishna teaches that all 4 types of breads are essential!? **A:** Todah is different, because it is compared to nazir.
 - **Q:** Regarding metozra the pasuk only says “torah” and yet a Mishna says that all 4 things are essential in the metzora process!? **A:** The pasuk there says “tihiyeh”, which teaches that it is essential.
 - **Q:** Regarding Yom Kippur the pasuk only says “chukah” and yet a Mishna says that the two goats are essential!? **A:** Rather, **Rav** meant that if the pasuk says “torah” *or* “chukah” it means it is essential.
 - **Q:** All other korbanos say the word “torah” and not all the details are essential!? **A:** The word torah still requires that the word chukah be written to teach that it is essential, but the word chukah teaches it is essential even if the word torah is not written.
 - **Q:** **Rav** said that torah and chukah are both equal in teaching that something is essential!? **A:** **Rav** was saying that even if the word torah is written, if it also says chukah it teaches that it is essential, but if it does not say chukah then it does not teach that it is essential.
 - **Q:** Regarding a mincha the pasuk says chukah, and yet **Rav** says that if a halacha is repeated that means it is essential. This suggests that if it is not repeated it is not considered to be essential even though it says chukah!? **A:** The word chukah is only written regarding the eating of the mincha, not the other avodos.
 - **Q:** Regarding the Lechem Hapanim the pasuk also says chukah only in regard to the eating, and yet a Mishna says that all aspects are essential – the two arrangements, the two spoons of levonah, etc. We see that even when it is written regarding the eating it is to be understood as teaching that *everything* is essential!? **A:** The fact that all is essential is not learned from chukah – it is learned from the fact that the Torah writes “its flour” and “its oil”.
 - We stated above that **Rav** says that whenever the Torah repeats something regarding the mincha it is to teach that it is essential. **Shmuel** argues and says that the requirement of the fine flour and the oil are essential, but nothing else is.
 - **Q:** Does **Shmuel** hold that a repeated halacha in the Torah is not meant to teach that it is essential? **A:** Rather, a repeated halacha certainly teaches that it is essential. The machlokes between them is whether we learn that something is essential from the pesukim of “melo kumtzo” and “b’kumtzo”. **Rav** says that this teaches that the kemitza must be done by hand, and we are also taught that Aharon did kemitza by hand, and therefore we are taught that it is essential. **Shmuel** says we can’t learn the halacha for future generations from a one-time mincha (of Aharon), and therefore it is not repeated and is not essential.
 - **Q:** We find that **Shmuel** does learn a halacha from the menachos of the Nesi’im (which was a one-time mincha)!? **A:** That case is different, because the pasuk is repeated 12 times (once for each Nasi). That is why he learns from that case.
 - **Q:** **R’ Kahana** and **R’ Assi** asked **Rav**, the Torah repeats the halacha of hagasha and yet it is not essential!? It is repeated in the pasuk of “Zos toras hamincha hakreiv osah Bnei Aharon lifnei Hashem”!? **A:** That pasuk is needed to teach which side of the Mizbe’ach the mincha is to be brought to. As a Braisa says, the pasuk says that the mincha should be brought “lifnei Hashem” (which means the west side of the Mizbe’ach) and also says “ehl pnei hamizbe’ach” (which means the south side). Therefore, we learn that it should be brought to the southwest corner. **R’ Eliezer** says that it was brought on the south side of that corner (not on the corner itself),

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

because he says that the entire Mizbe'ach was on the northern half of the Azarah, and therefore even the south side of the southwest corner is considered to be "lifnei Hashem", since it was opposite the opening to the Heichal. In this way, by bringing it to the south side of the corner he has fulfilled both pesukim.