



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Zevachim, Daf כ – Daf כו

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 כ--20-----

- **Q: Rav** had said that any halacha regarding a mincha which is repeated in the pasuk is repeated to teach that it is essential. If it is not repeated, it is not essential. **R' Huna** asked, the requirement to salt the mincha is not repeated and yet a Braisa says that **R' Yehuda and R' Shimon** agree that salting a korbon is essential!? **A: R' Yosef** said that **Rav** holds like the Tanna of our Mishna who holds that if the mincha was not salted it is still valid.
  - **Q: Abaye** asked, just as when the Mishna says “he did not pour oil” it means that there was oil poured, but it was poured by a non-Kohen, and that is when the mincha is still valid, so too regarding salting, it may be that the Mishna means it is valid if it is salted by a non-Kohen, but the salting is absolutely essential!? **A: R' Yosef** said, a non-Kohen may not come onto the Mizbe'ach (which is where the salting is done). Therefore, when the Mishna says that if it was not salted it is still valid, it cannot mean that it was salted by a non-Kohen.
  - **A2:** We can answer that since the pasuk regarding salt says “bris”, it is as if it was repeated, and therefore becomes essential.
  - **Q:** How can **R' Huna** say that the pasuk regarding salting is not repeated? The pasuk that gives the salting requirement repeats this requirement 3 times in the pasuk!? **A:** The parts of this pasuk are needed for drashos as taught in a Braisa. The Braisa says, if the pasuk would require salting without stating the word “mincha” we would think that even the blood and wood of the Mizbe'ach must be salted since they are also referred to as a “korbon”. The word “mincha” teaches that only things that are like a mincha, in that it requires other things to be brought to the Mizbe'ach with it (i.e. wood) require salting, but blood and wood do not. We would think to say that just as a mincha is matir (the kometz is matir the shirayim) so too anything that is matir must be salted, which would then include blood. The pasuk therefore says “from upon your mincha”, which we darshen to teach “but not from upon your blood”. We would think that the entire mincha (not just the kometz) must be salted. The pasuk therefore says “korbon”, which teaches that only the korbon of the mincha (the kometz) must be salted. This only teaches that the kometz must be salted. How do we know that the levonah must be salted as well? It must be salted because it is put into the same keili as the kometz. How do we know that levonah that is brought on its own, and all other korbanos also must be salted? The pasuk therefore says “ahl kol korbancha takriv melach”.
    - **Q:** The levonah and all other korbanos require wood to be brought on the Mizbe'ach as well, just like a mincha, so we should know that all these korbanos must have salt based on that comparison. Why do we need the pasuk of “ahl kol korbancha takriv melach”? **A:** The Braisa means to say that we should maybe darshen the word “korbon” as a klal and the word “mincha” as a prat to teach that the klal only includes mincha and nothing else. The Braisa therefore says that the pasuk of “ahl kol korbancha” is another klal, which creates a klal uprat uklal, which teaches that we include things that are like the prat (a mincha) in that they require salting if they cause other things to be brought on the Mizbe'ach along with them.
      - **Q:** What is meant by the “other things” that the korbanos require to be brought onto the Mizbe'ach? It is the requirement for wood to be brought. Maybe instead say that the “other things” is the levonah that the mincha requires to be brought, and if so I would say that blood also has to be salted, because it requires the bringing of nesachim as well!? **A:** Nesachim are brought on account of the eimurim, not for the blood.
        - **Q:** You assume that nesachim are brought for the eimurim so that there should be an offering of “eating” and “drinking”. Maybe instead say that the nesachim are brought for the blood so that there should be “kapparah” and “simcha”? **A:**

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

The levonah can't be compared to the nesachim, because the mincha and the levonah are brought in the same keili, whereas the nesachim are not brought in the same keili as the blood or the korbon. However, a mincha causes that wood be brought so that the mincha is burned. The same is true of the other korbanos and therefore that comparison can be made.

- **Q:** Maybe say that the klal uprat uklal teaches that something that is like a mincha in that it causes something else to be brought *and* is matir something to be eaten, must be salted, and the only comparison to that would be the spoonfuls of levonah which cause wood to be brought and are matir the Lechem Hapanim to be eaten!? **A:** From the fact that the Braisa says that “from upon your mincha” comes to exclude salting of blood we see that if not for that pasuk we would say that blood must be salted, even though blood is only similar to a mincha in one respect (it is also a matir).
- **Q:** Why does the Braisa darshen “from upon your mincha” to teach “but not from upon your blood”, maybe it should instead teach “but not from upon your korbanos limbs”!? **A:** It would make more sense to include the limbs as requiring salt, since that is similar to a mincha in that they both: require something else to be brought, are burned in fire, are done outside the Heichal, can become nossar, can make one chayuv for tumah, and can make one chayuv for me'ilah.
  - **Q:** Maybe it would make more sense to include blood as requiring salt, since it is similar to a mincha in that they both: are a matir, and become passul at nightfall!? **A:** The limbs are similar to a mincha in more ways.
- **Q:** The Braisa said that wood and blood are also referred to as korbanos. Who is the view that wood is referred to as a korbon? It is the view of **Rebbi**. Now, **Rebbi** says in a Braisa that wood is considered to be a korbon mincha and must be salted!? If so, how can the Braisa follow **Rebbi** and still say that wood does not require salting? **A:** We must remove the mention of wood from the Braisa.
  - **Q:** If so, what does the pasuk of “mincha” come to exclude? It is not needed to exclude blood, because that is learned from the pasuk of “from upon your mincha”!? **A:** Instead of wood insert nesachim into the Braisa, as we see in another Braisa that nesachim are not required to be salted.

### -----Daf נ"ד--21-----

- **Q:** The Braisa said that a pasuk teaches to exclude blood from the requirement to be salted before being put on the Mizbe'ach. This suggests that without the pasuk we would think that the blood must be salted. However, we have learned that **Ze'iri in the name of R' Chanina** said that blood that was cooked would not be assur to eat as regular blood, and **R' Yehuda in the name of Ze'iri** said that blood that was salted would not be assur to eat as regular blood. We see that salting removes it from the status of blood. Therefore, even without the pasuk we would know that the blood should not be salted, because if it is salted it loses its status of blood and could not be brought on the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** We have thought to add a tiny amount of salt, which would not remove its status as blood, but which would also allow us to fulfil the requirement of salting korbanos.
  - **Q:** **Rava** repeated the first ruling of **Ze'iri** (that cooked blood is not assur). **Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that if one hardened blood by cooking it and ate it, or if one melted fats and drank it, he would be chayuv!? **A:** **Rava** said, **Ze'iri** is talking about where it was cooked with fire and will therefore never regain its status as blood, and the Braisa is discussing where it was cooked in the sun, where it will regain its status as blood, because it will return to its original state.
  - **Q:** Even when it is cooked in the sun we should say that since it was at one point rejected, it should remain rejected, as we find that **R' Yochanan** said that one would not be chayuv for eating blood that was hardened and then became a liquid again, because once it was rejected it remains rejected!? **A:** **Rava** remained quiet. **Abaye** said, maybe we can answer that the Braisa is referring to blood of chataos that are offered on the outside Mizbe'ach, which becomes valid

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

after it is hardened in the sun and then allowed to liquefy. **Ze'iri** is discussing blood of chatas that are offered on the inside Mizbe'ach, which remains assur even after it liquefies. **Rava** said, you are correct, and **R' Chisda** said this as well.

- **Rava** himself holds that even blood of an inside chatas that was hardened and then eaten would make the person chayuv, since such blood would be valid for an outside chatas.
  - **R' Pappa** said, based on this, if the blood of a donkey was hardened and one ate it, he would be chayuv. Just as blood of an inner chatas that was hardened is not fit to be offered and yet one is chayuv for eating it, the same is true for the hardened blood of a donkey, which although is not fit to be offered makes one chayuv for eating it.
- **R' Gidal in the name of Ze'iri** said, blood on a person's body, whether it is moist or dry blood, acts as a chatzitza for purposes of mikvah.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that dry blood acts as a chatzitza, but moist blood does not!? **A: Ze'iri** is referring to blood that is sticky and sticks to the person (and therefore prevents the water from touching him). The Braisa is referring to blood that is not sticky.
- **Q:** The pasuk regarding salting says "bamelach timlach", using a double verbiage. What is the word "timlach" coming to teach? **A:** A Braisa says, if the pasuk only said "bamelach" we would think to put on salt "tevoneihu" (to be explained by the Gemara). The pasuk therefore says "timlach". If it had only said "timlach" we would think that even saltwater is good enough. The pasuk therefore says "bamelach". The pasuk says "v'lo sashbis melach", which teaches that the salt used for the Mizbe'ach must be salt that never ceases to be found in any season, which is Sedomis salt. The word "takriv" teaches that if there is no Sedomis salt to be had we may even use Istrokanis salt. "Takriv" also teaches that the salt may come from anywhere (even chutz laaretz), it also teaches that it is even done on Shabbos, and also teaches that it is even done when the korbon is being brought b'tumah.
  - **Q:** What does "tevoneihu" mean? **A: Rabbah bar Ullah** said, it means we would have thought to make it very thick (a lot of salt) like straw in clay.
    - **Abaye** said, if that is what is meant, the word used should have been "yisbonenu". Rather, it means we would think to build the salt like a building, row upon row.
      - **Rava** said, if that is what is meant, the word used should have been "yivnenu". Rather it means "tivuneihu", which **R' Ashi** explains to mean just a small amount. The pasuk says "timlach" to teach that it has to be a larger amount of salt than that.
  - **Q:** How is the salting done? He brings the limb and puts salt on it, turns it over and again puts salt on it, and then brings it onto the Mizbe'ach.
    - **Abaye** said, this is also the way to salt in order to remove the blood of meat that will be cooked.
- A Braisa says, salt that is on the korbon itself is subject to me'ilah. Salt that has fallen onto the ramp or the Mizbe'ach is not. **R' Masna** says, the source for this is a pasuk that refers to the salt as part of the Olah as well.
  - A Mishna says that the **Rabanan** allowed the Kohanim to benefit from the wood and salt of the Beis Hamikdash. **Shmuel** explained that they allowed them to use these for their own korbanos, but never allowed them to eat them.
    - **Q:** This suggests that they are allowed to salt their korbanos to be put on the Mizbe'ach, but not to salt the korbanos that would be eaten. This seems incorrect, because a Braisa teaches that the salt of the Beis Hamikdash was used to salt the skins of the korbanos. It can't be that the salt could be used for the salting of the skins but could not be used for the eating of the korbanos!? **A:** Rather, when **Shmuel** says that they allowed it for their korbanos he meant that they allowed it for the eating of their korbanos. When he says they did not allow it to be eaten, he meant to be eaten with their chullin.
      - **Q:** That seems obvious!? Chullin may not even be in the Mikdash!? **A:** We have learned that chullin may be eaten along with terumah and kodashim. **Shmuel** teaches that even so, salt of the Beis Hamikdash may not be used on that chullin.
      - **Ravina** said to **R' Ashi**, this must be what **Shmuel** meant to explain the Mishna, because the **Rabanan** would not have had to give a special heter for the Kohanim to use the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Mikdash salt for their korbanos, because we are taught in a Braisa that even a Yisrael takes salt from the Mikdash for his korbanos!

- **R' Mordechai** said to **R' Ashi**, this is not a valid proof. It may be that the Mishna is teaching that the **Rabanan** allowed a Kohen to use the salt for his korbon to go on the Mizbe'ach. **R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said, the reason they had to do so is according to the view of **Ben Buchri**, who says that Kohanim did not give a machtzis hashekel (which was used to purchase the salt of the Mikdash). We would think that since they don't give a machtzis hashekel they have no rights to the salt. The Mishna therefore teaches that they do.

-----Daf כב---22-----

- The Gemara quoted a Braisa which, among other things, said that the wood needed to be brought along with a korbon is taken from the tzibbur.
  - **Q:** How does the Tanna of the Braisa know this? **A:** A Braisa says, **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** says that the pasuk of “ahl ha'eitzim asher ahl ha'eish asher ahl haMizbe'ach” teaches that just as the Mizbe'ach belongs to the tzibbur, the fire and wood used for korbanos also comes from the tzibbur. **R' Elazar ben Shamu'ah** says, that the pasuk teaches that just as the Mizbe'ach must be from materials never used by a regular person, so too the wood and fire must have never been used by a regular person.
    - **Q:** What is the difference between these views? **A:** The difference is whether only new wood may be used.
    - **Q:** Is it true that old wood may not be used? We find that **R' Elazar ben Shamu'ah** says in a Braisa that Dovid offered korbanos on the place of the future Beis Hamikdash and used wood of “morigim and cattle equipment”. We see that there is no requirement to use new wood on a bamah!? **A:** We could answer that these items had never been used, and therefore it was new wood.
      - **Ulla and R' Yehuda** explain that “morigim” is a type of tool used for threshing.

### MISHNA

- If the kometz of one mincha became mixed with the kometz of another mincha, or it became mixed with the mincha of a Kohen, or with the mincha of the Kohen Gadol, or with a minchas nesachim (all of which are totally burned on the Mizbe'ach), they are all valid. **R' Yehuda** says, when it became mixed with the mincha of the Kohen Gadol or a minchas nesachim, it is passul, because the kometz is a thick mixture and the mincha of the Kohen Gadol and the minchas nesachim are thin mixtures and the mixing of the two types will cause them to absorb from each other (thereby changing their proper consistency).

### GEMARA

- A Mishna says, if blood of a korbon became mixed with water, then if the mixture still looks like blood, it is considered to be valid blood (and can be used for zrika). If the blood became mixed with wine, we view the wine as if it were water (if there is enough blood in the mixture that if the wine were water the mixture would look like blood, it is valid). If blood of a korbon became mixed with blood of an animal that is not a korbon or with the blood of a chaya, we view the other blood as if it were water (if there is enough blood in the mixture that if the other blood was water the mixture would look like blood, it is valid). **R' Yehuda** says, that blood cannot nullify blood (and therefore if even a drop of korbon blood was mixed into a large amount of blood from an animal that is not a korbon, the mixture is valid to be used for zrika).
  - **R' Yochanan** explains that both views are based on the pasuk of “v'lakach midam hapar umidam hasa'ir”. Now, clearly the amount of blood of a par is far more than the blood of a goat. Yet, when it is mixed the Torah refers to the mixture as being of each of the two types of bloods. The **Rabanan** hold that from here we learn that things that go up on the Mizbe'ach are not mevatel each other. **R' Yehuda** says, from here we learn that things of like kind (they are both blood) are not mevatel each other.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The **Rabanan** hold, if the pasuk meant that they don't become batul because they are of like kind, it would have taught this concept in other areas of halacha – not in regard to things that are brought up on the Mizbe'ach.
  - **Q:** Maybe both things are needed (like-kind and things that go up onto the Mizbe'ach)!? That remains a KASHYEH.
- **R' Yehuda** holds that if the pasuk meant that they don't become batul because they are things that go up onto the Mizbe'ach, it would have given an example using things that are not of like kind.
  - **Q:** Maybe both things are needed (like-kind and things that go up onto the Mizbe'ach)!? That remains a KASHYEH.
- **Q:** In our Mishna **R' Yehuda** said that when a kometz became mixed with the mincha of the Kohen Gadol or a minchas nesachim, it is passul, because the kometz is a thick mixture and the mincha of the Kohen Gadol and the minchas nesachim are thin mixtures and the mixing of the two types will cause them to absorb from each other. Now, why is he concerned that they will absorb from each other? Since they are of like kind they will not become batul!? **A: Rava** said, **R' Yehuda** holds that whenever there are items of like kind mixed together and there is another item of not like kind mixed along with them, we view the mixture as having removed the item of like kind, and leaving over the item of not like kind, in which case the larger item is mevatel the smaller item.

### -----Daf לך---23-----

- If oil was put into a chatas mincha, **R' Yochanan** says it is passul and **Reish Lakish** says it is valid, since a chatas mincha is anyway supposed to have some oil rubbed into it.
  - **Q:** The pasuk regarding the chatas mincha says that oil should not be put on it!? **A:** That means that it is not to get the amount of oil as other menachos get.
  - **Q: R' Yochanan** asked **Reish Lakish**, a Braisa says, if a dry mincha became mixed with a mincha that has oil, it may still be offered. **R' Yehuda** says it may not be offered. Presumably this is talking about a chatas mincha that was mixed with another mincha, and the only reason the **T"K** says it may be offered is because it is oil of another korbon, which itself is to be offered on the Mizbe'ach (and things that go onto the Mizbe'ach are not mevatel each other). This suggests that if the chatas mincha had some other oil added to it, it would be passul even according to the **T"K**!? **A:** The Braisa is not discussing the chatas mincha. It is discussing a case of where the mincha accompanying a bull or ram became mixed with the mincha accompanying a lamb (which has more oil per amount of flour).
    - **Q:** The Braisa first explicitly discusses the menachos that accompany bulls, rams, and lambs, and then discusses a dry and oiled mincha, so that can't refer to the menachos of the bull, ram, and lamb!? **A:** The Braisa first states the case and then gives the reason why the menachos of bulls, rams, and lambs that mix are a problem – it is because those of the bull and ram are considered to be dry, whereas the mincha of a lamb is more oily.
- **Q: Rava** asked, if the oil of a kometz was squeezed out onto wood and that wood was then burned along with it on the Mizbe'ach, is the kometz considered to be missing oil? Do we say that the attachment of things that are going up on the Mizbe'ach makes them to be considered like one unit and therefore the kometz and the oil are still one, or do we not say that?
  - **Q: Ravina** said to **R' Ashi**, we can say that this is the subject of a machlokes between **R' Yochanan** and **Reish Lakish**. We have learned that if someone offers a korbon outside the Mikdash, but there is less than a kezayis of meat, but with the bone that it is attached to there is a kezayis, **R' Yochanan** says he is chayuv, because things attached to the korbon have the status of the korbon itself, and **Reish Lakish** says he is patur, because things attached to the korbon do not have the status of the korbon itself. This seems to be the issue addressed by **Rava**! **A: R' Ashi** said, the question can be asked according to **R' Yochanan**, because it may be that he only holds that a bone and meat are considered attached, since

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

they come from the same animal, but oil and flour would not be considered as one unit. The question can also be asked according to **Reish Lakish**, because he may only hold that a bone and meat are not considered one unit, since the bone is not supposed to be offered along with the meat. However, the oil and flour are supposed to be offered together, and so maybe they would be considered to become attached as one unit.

- The Gemara remains with a **TEIKU**.

### MISHNA

- If two menachos became mixed with each other before their kemitzos were taken, if a kometz can still be taken from each one separately, they are valid. If not, they are passul.
- If a kometz became mixed with a mincha that had not yet had its kometz taken, the mixture should not be offered on the Mizbe'ach. If it was offered, the owners of the mincha which had the kometz taken have fulfilled their obligation. The owners of the mincha that did not have the kometz taken have not fulfilled their obligation.
- If the kometz of a mincha became mixed with its shirayim, or with the shirayim of another mincha, the mixture should not be offered on the Mizbe'ach. If it was offered, the owner of the kometz has fulfilled his obligation.

### GEMARA

- **R' Chisda** said, neveila meat becomes batul in a larger amount of shechted meat, because the shechted meat cannot become tamei like neveila meat (and they are therefore considered to be of unlike kinds). Shechted meat does not become batul in a larger amount of neveila meat, because neveila can lose its tumah when it spoils and becomes like the shechted meat (they are therefore of like kind, which does not become batul according to **R' Yehuda**). **R' Chanina** says, if the minority can become like the majority it is not batul (they are considered to be like kind), but if it can't, it becomes batul (this is the opposite of what **R' Chisda** said).
  - **Q:** According to whose view do they argue? They can't be arguing according to the **Rabanan**, because they say that anything brought on the Mizbe'ach are not mevatel each other, but things of like kind can be mevatel each other. They also can't be arguing according to **R' Yehuda**, because **R' Yehuda** looks to the physical appearance of the items in the mixture to decide whether they are like kind, and in both these cases the meats in the mixture look the same and would therefore be of like kind!? **A:** It is according to **R' Chiya**, who taught a Braisa that says that neveila meat and shechted meat are mevatel one another.
    - **Q:** Who does this anonymous Braisa of **R' Chiya** follow? It can't follow the **Rabanan or R' Yehuda**, for the reasons explained above!? **A:** It follows the view of **R' Yehuda**, because he holds that like kind are not mevatel each other only when it is possible for one to take on the characteristics of the other (in addition to like physical appearance). Based on this, the machlokes above is that **R' Chisda** says we look to the majority in making this determination, and **R' Chanina** says we look to the minority.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from our Mishna. The Mishna said, if two menachos became mixed with each other before their kemitzos were taken, if a kometz can still be taken from each one separately, they are valid. If not, they are passul. Now, once he takes the kometz from one, the rest of that mincha becomes shirayim, and it seems that the shirayim would not be mevatel the other mincha (in a case where the shirayim is the majority of the mixture). Now, this can't follow the **Rabanan**, because they say that only things that are brought onto the Mizbe'ach don't become batel, but like kind things can become batel (and the shirayim is not brought up onto the Mizbe'ach, so it should be mevatel). It must follow **R' Yehuda**. Now, according to **R' Chanina** this makes sense, because the minority (the mincha from which the kometz was not yet taken) can become like the majority (the shirayim) when its kometz is taken, and therefore it is considered to be like kind, which is why it does not become batel. However, according to **R' Chisda**, the majority cannot become like the minority, so they should be considered of unlike kind, and it should become batel!? Maybe we should say that our Mishna does not follow **R' Chisda or R' Chiya**? **A:** We can answer based on **R' Zeira** who says that there is a gezeira shava between

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the kometz and the shirayim. The gezeira shava teaches that just as one kometz is not mevatel another kometz, so too shirayim are not mevatel a kometz.

- **Q:** The Mishna then said, if a kometz became mixed with a mincha that had not yet had its kometz taken, the mixture should not be offered on the Mizbe'ach. If it was offered, the owners of the mincha which had the kometz taken have fulfilled their obligation. The owners of the mincha that did not have the kometz taken have not fulfilled their obligation. Now, the Mishna seems to clearly say that the kometz does not become batel to the other mincha in the mixture. This can't follow the **Rabanan**, because they say that only things that are brought onto the Mizbe'ach don't become batel, but like kind things can become batel (and the mincha whose kometz was not yet taken is not brought up onto the Mizbe'ach, so it should be mevatel). It must follow **R' Yehuda**. Now according to **R' Chisda** this makes sense, because the majority (the mincha from which the kometz was not yet taken) can become like the minority (the kometz) because each part can be taken as the kometz, and therefore it is considered to be like kind, which is why it does not become batel. However, according to **R' Chanina**, the minority cannot become like the majority, so they should be considered of unlike kind, and it should become batel!? **A:** Here too, we can answer based on **R' Zeira**.
- **Q:** The Mishna then said, if the kometz of a mincha became mixed with its shirayim, or with the shirayim of another mincha, the mixture should not be offered on the Mizbe'ach. If it was offered, the owner of the kometz has fulfilled his obligation. Now, in this case the majority (the shirayim) cannot become like the minority (the kometz) or visa-versa, so they should be considered as unlike kinds and should become batel, so why does the Mishna say that they don't!? This can't follow the view of the **Rabanan** (as explained above) and can't follow the view of **R' Yehuda** according to either shitah of what he holds!? **A:** **R' Zeira** said, there is a gezeira shava between the kometz and the shirayim. The gezeira shava teaches that just as one kometz is not mevatel another kometz, so too shirayim are not mevatel a kometz.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, if spices are added to matzah the matzah is valid, but is called "spiced matzah". The Gemara assumes that this even refers to a case where enough spices were added to make the spices the majority of the mixture. Now, according to **R' Chanina** this makes sense, because the minority (the matzah) can become like the majority (the spices), because when the matzah spoils it will lose its status of matzah and will in that way be like the spices. Therefore, they are considered to be of like kind, which is why it does not become batel. However, according to **R' Chisda**, since the spices cannot become like the matzah it should be considered a mixture of unlike kinds, and therefore it should become batel!? **A:** The case of the Braisa is where the matzah is the majority, and that is why it does not become batel. The Braisa suggests that this is the case by saying that the mixture is called "spiced matzah" (referring to the mixture as a type of matzah, which suggests that the matzah is the majority). SHEMAH MINAH.

### -----Daf 7D---24-----

- When **R' Kahana** went to EY he met the sons of **R' Chiya** who asked, what is the halacha if someone splits the flour of a mincha into two and puts it into a bowl in a way that the two halves are not touching, and a tvul yom then touched one of the halves? When a Mishna says that a keili combines what is in it with regard to kodesh, is that only when the items in the keili are touching each other or is it even if they are not touching each other? **R' Kahana** told them, the Mishna's verbiage of "a keili combines" suggests that the keili combines them even if they are not touching.
  - **Q:** They then asked him, what if someone took a third half from another mincha and put it in between the two halves in the bowl and a tvul yom touched that new half, would that make the other two halves passul as well? **A:** **R' Kahana** said, a keili only combines things that need to be in that keili. This flour from the other mincha does not need to be in the keili along with the first mincha, and therefore it is not considered to be combined along with the two halves of the first mincha.
  - **Q:** They then asked, what if the tvul yom sticks his finger into the airspace between the two halves? Would it make the two halves tamei? **A:** He answered, the only thing that can become tamei through airspace is an earthenware keili.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Kahana** then asked them, can one take a kemitza from one half for the other? Is the rule that the keili combines them a halacha D'Oraisa or D'Rabanan? **A:** They said, we have not learned this exact case, but we have learned the halacha in a similar case. The Mishna says that if two menachos became mixed, but it is possible to take a kemitza from each separately, they are valid. Now, presumably the case is that there is a section where the menachos are mixed, and then an unattached piece of each mincha that is not mixed, and from which a kemitza can be taken. If so, we see that even though it is not touching the rest of its own mincha (the part that is mixed with the other mincha) it is still a valid kemitza for it!
  - **Rava** said this is not a valid proof, because the case of the Mishna may be where the part of each mincha that was not mixed with the other mincha was attached to the part of the mincha that is mixed with the other mincha. That may be the reason that a kemitza can be taken for it.
  - **Q:** Where do we come out on this question? **A: Rava** said, a Braisa says, the pasuk says “v'heirim mimenu”, which teaches that the kometz must be taken from flour attached to the mincha, meaning that he should not bring the mincha separated into two keilim and then take a kometz from one for the other. Now, this implies that if the two halves were in one keili, similar to being in two keilim (they were separated apart in one keili), he would be able to take a kemitza from one for the other!
    - **Abaye** said this is not a valid proof. The case of the two keilim may be that a smaller keili was placed into a larger keili and the flour overflowed from the smaller into the larger, but since the wall of the keili acts as a barrier through the airspace of the outer keili they are not considered to be connected even though they touch up above the airspace of the keili. The case of the one keili that is similar to two keilim would be a keili that has low dividers within it which don't reach the height of the walls of the keili. In that case, since the flour touches above these dividers, still within the airspace of the keili, they are considered connected. However, in our case the two halves are not touching at all, and so we have the question as to what the halacha will be.
- **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, if the two halves of a mincha are separated in a keili, and one of those halves is attached to a third half (of another mincha) by water, and the half not connected with water becomes tamei (thereby making the second half in the keili tamei because they are combined in one keili), does the third half outside the keili become tamei as well? Do we say that when the Mishna says that items in a keili are considered as combined for kodesh that is only for matters inside the keili, but not for things outside the keili, or do we say that once it is considered to be combined, it is considered to be fully combined for all matters? If you will say that once it is considered to be combined, it is considered to be fully combined for all matters, what if the outside half became tamei, making the half connected to it by water tamei as well, would the other half in the keili become tamei? Do we say that the keili only combines where the source of tumah is inside the keili, but not when it comes from outside, or do we say there is no difference? **TEIKU**.
- **Q: Rava** asked, what if the mincha was divided and one of the halves became tamei and the two halves were then put into a keili, and a tvul yom then touched the tamei one, will the other become tamei? Do we say that that half is already fully tamei and the touching of the tvul yom therefore doesn't effect it at all (and it therefore won't spread to the other half), or not? **A: Abaye** said, we see from a Mishna that **R' Yose** holds that a sheet that become tamei medras (a severe tumah from a zav laying on it) can still become tamei from the touching of a zav (which is only relevant if the tumas medras is later removed), and we don't say that the sheet was already fully tamei and can't accept more tumah!
  - **Rava** said, **R' Yose** may be talking about where the sheet was *first* touched by a zav and *then* became tamei medras. Since tumas medras is so severe, it can take effect on the sheet that was already tamei from the touching of a zav. However, the reverse may not be true.
  - **Q: Abaye** said, we can bring a proof from the later part of the Mishna, which says that **R' Yose** agrees that if there are two sheets folded on top of each other and a zav sits on them, the upper one is tamei medras and the lower one is tamei medras and tamei from touching a zav. We see that we don't say that it is fully tamei and can't accept more tumah!? **A: Rava** said, this case is

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

different, because both tumos came at the same time. The case of the mincha was where one tumah came later on.

- **Rava** said, if a person divided a mincha and lost one of the halves, then designated a new half to take its place, and then found the lost half, and now all three halves are in one keili, the halacha is that if the lost one becomes tamei, the other original half becomes tamei as well, but the replacement does not. If the replacement became tamei, the original half that was not lost also becomes tamei, but the lost half does not. If the original half that was not lost becomes tamei, the lost half and the replacement also become tamei as well. **Abaye** said, even if the lost one or the replacement become tamei, all the others become tamei as well. The reason is that all 3 are “members of the same house” (they are of the same mincha).
  - **Rava** said that the same is regarding the kemitza. If the kometz was taken from the lost one, its shirayim and the shirayim of the other original half may be eaten, but the shirayim of the replacement may not be eaten. If the kometz was taken from the replacement, its shirayim and the shirayim of the original half that was not lost may be eaten, but the shirayim of the half that was lost may not be eaten. If the kometz was taken from the half that was not lost, neither the shirayim of the lost one or the replacement may be eaten. **Abaye** said, even if the kometz was from the lost one or the replacement none of the others may be eaten. The reason is that all 3 are “members of the same house” (they are of the same mincha).
    - **Q: R’ Pappa** asked, can the shirayim of the one from which the kometz was taken be eaten? Part of the kometz was taken for the third half, which is passul, which makes the kometz passul, which should therefore not allow the shirayim to be eaten!? **R’ Yitzchak the son of R’ Mesharshiya** asked, how can the kometz be offered? The part of the kometz that is taken for the third half is in essence chullin!? **A: R’ Ashi** said, the kometz is dependent on the intent of the Kohen, and we can assume that he only had in mind for two halves, not three (since that would make it passul). Our only question is to which other half he had intent, and that is why we can’t eat the other halves.

### -----Daf 75-----25-----

#### MISHNA

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

#### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “v’nasa Aharon es avon hakodashim”. Which aveira is referred to in the pasuk which teaches that the tzitz renders a passul korbon valid? It can’t refer to piggul, because the pasuk regarding piggul says “lo yeichasheiv”, which teaches that it is absolutely passul. It also can’t refer to nossar, because the pasuk regarding nossar says “lo yeiratzeh”, which teaches that it is absolutely passul. Rather, it must be referring to the psul of tumah, which we find is lenient in that it is waived for a korbon tzibbur.
  - **Q: R’ Zeira** asked, maybe it refers to the psul of yotzeh, which we find is lenient in that it is waived for a korbon brought on a bamah? **A: Abaye** said, the pasuk regarding the tzitz says “lifnei Hashem”, which teaches that it brings acceptance for a psul that is done in the Mikdash.
  - **Q: R’ Illa’ah** asked, maybe it refers to the psul of an avodah done with the left hand, which we find is lenient in that it is mutar during the Avodos of Yom Kippur? **A: Abaye** said, the pasuk refers to the psul as an “avon” (a sin), and the Avodah using the left hand on Yom Kippur is the proper way to do that Avodah, and certainly not a sin. **A2: R’ Ashi** said, the pasuk says that the tzitz brings acceptance for the “avon hakodashim” (the sin of the korbanos), which suggests that it is not referring to a psul of the Kohen (which is what using the left hand would be).

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Sima the son of R' Idi** said to **R' Ashi**, maybe it refers to the psul of baal mum, which we find is lenient in that it is not a psul for bird korbanos? **A: R' Ashi** said, the pesukim regarding a baal mum say “lo yeiratze” and “ki lo l'ratzon yihiyeh lachem”, which teach that there can be no acceptance for them.
- A Braisa says, if blood became tamei and was then offered on the Mizbe'ach, if it was done b'shogeg, the korban is accepted. If it was done b'meizid, the korban is not accepted. This is for individual korbanos. With regard to korbanos of the tzibbur it is accepted whether it was done b'shogeg or b'meizid. With regard to the korbanos of goyim, whether it was done b'shogeg or b'meizid it is not accepted.
  - **Q:** This seems to contradict another Braisa that says that the tzitz brings acceptance for the blood, meat, or cheilev of a korban that became tamei and was offered, whether b'shogeg, b'meizid, b'oneis, or willingly, whether it is the korban of an individual or of the tzibbur!? **A: R' Yosef** said, this second Braisa follows the view of **R' Yose**, whereas the first Braisa follows the view of the **Rabanan**, from a Braisa. The Braisa says, one may not separate terumah from tamei produce for produce that is tahor. If it was separated, then if it was done b'shogeg it is a valid separation of terumah, but if it was done b'meizid it is not. **R' Yose** says, whether it was done b'shogeg or b'meizid it is a valid separation of terumah. We see that the **Rabanan** differentiate between shogeg and meizid, whereas **R' Yose** does not.
    - **Q:** From this Braisa we only find that **R' Yose** does not penalize one for doing an act b'meizid. It doesn't show that he holds that the tzitz would bring acceptance for the meat that is eaten!? In fact, a Braisa says that **R' Yose** argues on **R' Eliezer** and holds that the tzitz does *not* bring acceptance for meat that is eaten!? **A:** We must reverse the views of this Braisa so that it is **R' Eliezer** who says that the tzitz does *not* bring acceptance for meat that is eaten.
      - **Q: R' Sheishes** asked, how can you reverse the views? Another Braisa, which says that the tzitz brings acceptance for the parts of the korban that are eaten, also says that the zrika is not effective for a korban that has left the Azarah. Now this (that the zrika is not effective for a korban that has left the Azarah) is the view of **R' Eliezer**, which means that the Braisa is his view, which also means that his view is that the tzitz brings acceptance for the parts of the korban that are eaten!? **A:** Rather, **R' Chisda** said, the second Braisa follows the view of **R' Eliezer**, whereas the first Braisa follows the view of the **Rabanan**.
        - **Q:** We only find that **R' Eliezer** holds that the tzitz brings acceptance for the parts that are eaten. We don't find that he holds that he does not penalize one for acting b'meizid!? **A:** We don't find that, because regarding terumah he said that the tamei terumah that was separated is a valid separation of terumah, whether it was done b'shogeg or b'meizid.
        - **Q:** Maybe **R' Eliezer** only holds that way and doesn't penalize regarding terumah, which is lenient, but would not hold that way regarding kodashim, which is more stringent!? **A:** If this is true, whose view would the Braisa follow? It must be that he does not differentiate between terumah and kodashim.
      - **Ravina** said, the first Braisa is discussing the zrika, and regarding that there is a difference between shogeg and meizid. The second Braisa is discussing the way in which the korban became tamei, and regarding that there is no difference between shogeg and meizid.
      - **R' Shila** said, the first Braisa is discussing the way in which the korban became tamei, and regarding that there is a difference between shogeg and meizid. The second Braisa is discussing the zrika, and regarding that there is no difference between shogeg and meizid.
        - **Q:** The second Braisa does not seem to be discussing the zrika at all!? **A:** We can explain the Braisa as referring to the zrika.
        - **Q:** A Braisa says, if blood became tamei and was then used for zrika, if it was done b'shogeg it is accepted, but if it was done b'meizid it is not accepted. This refutes what **R' Shila** said!? **A:** The Braisa should be understood as saying, if blood became tamei and was then used for zrika – whether the zrika was done b'shogeg or b'meizid – the halacha

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

is, if it became tamei b'shoge it is accepted, but if it became tamei b'meizid it is not accepted.

-----Daf 12---26-----

### MISHNA

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

### GEMARA

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

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## MISHNA

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

## GEMARA

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

## HIKTIR KUMTZA PAMAYIM KISHEIRA

- **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, this suggests that it is valid if done in two parts, but not if done in more than two parts. **R' Yochanan** said, even in many parts it would be valid.
  - **Q:** What is the machlokes between them? **A:** **R' Zeira** said, the machlokes is whether there is a kometz less than 2 zeysim and whether there can be a burning of less than a kezayis. **R' Yehoshua** holds that there is not and **R' Yochanan** holds that there is.
- With regard to the kometz, at what point does it allow the shirayim to be eaten? **R' Chanina** said, when the fire catches onto it, and **R' Yochanan** said, when the fire takes hold of most of it.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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