



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Mishna

If the leftovers of the minchah became impure, burned, or lost, according to Rabbi Eliezer (*who holds that if there is blood from a sacrifice it may be sprinkled even though there is no meat from the sacrifice leftover*), the minchah is still valid. According to Rabbi Yehoshua, it is invalid. (26a)

Leftovers

Rav states: This is only if all of the leftovers of the minchah were made impure. However, if only some of them were made impure, it is valid.

The *Gemora* asks: This (*the fact that Rav only said this regarding the minchah becoming impure*) indicates that Rav only said this regarding the minchah becoming impure. However, if it was lost or burned, it would still not be valid. Why should this be? If he holds the leftovers are significant, this should also apply to a minchah where some of it was lost or burned. If he holds the leftovers are insignificant, but a minchah that was partially made impure is valid because the tzitz atones for the impurity, Rabbi Yehoshua should agree it is valid even if all of it becomes impure!

The *Gemora* answers: Rav actually holds that leftovers are significant. When he said that when there are leftovers that were not made impure it is valid, he meant that the same holds true if there were leftovers that were not burned or lost. The reason why he only stated the case of impurity was because this was the first case stated in the Mishna (*he meant “etc.”*).

(*Rav’s law is supported by the following braisa.*) This is as the braisa states: All of the sacrifices in the Torah that have a kzayis of meat or a kzayis of fat leftover can have the sprinkling be done. If there is only a half of a kzayis of meat and a half of a kzayis of fat, the sprinkling of the blood cannot be done (*as they do not combine to make a kzayis*). However, if the sacrifice is an olah the sprinkling can be done, as the entire sacrifice is burned (*and there is therefore a kzayis that is burned*). Regarding a minchah, even if the entire minchah is extant one should not sprinkle the blood.

The *Gemora* asks: What does a minchah have to do with sprinkling blood?

Rav Papa says: The braisa is referring to a minchah nesachim (*which is brought along with an animal sacrifice*). One might think that being that it is brought along with the sacrifice it should be considered like the sacrifice itself. This is why the braisa states that it is not significant regarding the sprinkling of the blood.

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know that if only a kzayis of forbidden fat is left (*and there is no meat*) one may still sprinkle the blood?

Rabbi Yochanan says in the name of Rabbi Yishmael, and some say in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Chananya: The verse states, *And he will burn the fat for a nice smell for Hashem*. This teaches that the burning of the fat alone is significant, even without the meat.



The *Gemora* asks: This is a source for forbidden fat. What is the source that the yoseres (*diaphragm near the liver*) and two kidneys are significant enough (*if a kzayis of them remains*) to sprinkle the blood?

The *Gemora* answers: We can deduce this from our braisa. The braisa stated that even if the entire minchah is extant, one cannot sprinkle the blood. This indicates that if the yoseres and two kidneys are there one can sprinkle the blood.

The *Gemora* asks: How does the braisa know this from the verse?

Rabbi Yochanan answers: *For a pleasant smell* indicates that whatever is offered as a pleasant smell is significant enough to enable the blood to be sprinkled (*if a kzayis of it remains*).

The *Gemora* explains: Both the verse *fat* and *for a pleasant smell* are necessary. If it would only say *fat*, one would think that only fat is significant, not the yoseres and kidneys. This is why the verse states, *For a pleasant smell*. If it would only state *for a pleasant smell*, one would think that even a minchah brought with the sacrifice should be enough. This is why the verse states *Fat*. (26a)

Mishna

If the kometz was not made holy in the vessel (*after it was separated from the rest of the minchah*), it is invalid. Rabbi Shimon says: It is valid. If the kometz was offered twice (*see Gemora below*), it is valid. (26a)

Which Hand?

Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rabbi Chiya says: What is the reasoning of Rabbi Shimon? The verse states: *It is kodoshim like a chatas and ashram*. If one wants to offer the minchah with his hand, he should do so with his right hand like a chatas. If he wants to offer it with a vessel, he should do it (even) with his left hand like an ashram. Rabbi Yanai says: Once he did the kometz from a kli shares, he can offer it even

with his belt, or even with a regular (*not holy*) vessel of earthenware. Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak says: Everyone agrees that the kometz must be sanctified. (*The argument in the Mishnah is regarding how one offers the kometz after it was sanctified, not regarding whether or not it must be sanctified.*)

The *Gemora* asks a question from a braisa. The braisa states: The offering of fats, limbs, and wood that is done whether by hand or vessel, with one's right or left hand, is valid. The kometz, incense, and frankincense that is done whether by hand or vessel, with one's right or left hand, is valid. This is seemingly a strong question against Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rabbi Chiya! (*Rashi explains that being that the braisa says one can even offer it with his left hand, and it is clearly following the opinion of Rabbi Shimon who says a kli shares is not necessary, this is a strong question on Rabbi Yehudah.*)

Rabbi Yehudah will answer: The braisa means to divide its statement. If one does it with his hand, he must offer it with his right hand. If he does it with a vessel, he can offer it either with his left or right hand.

The *Gemora* asks a question on Rav Nachman from a braisa. The braisa states: If someone did the kemitzah without a kli shares, and made it holy without a kli shares, and offered it without a kli shares, it is invalid. Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say it is valid if he puts it in a vessel (*this indicates any vessel may be used, not specifically a kli shares*). (*This is a question on Rav Nachman who says that everyone agrees a kli shares is needed after the kemitzah to sanctify the kemitzah*).

The *Gemora* answers: They mean that after it is put in a vessel (*after the kometz*) it does not have to be placed in a vessel again (*to bring it to the altar and burn it*).

The *Gemora* asks a question on Rav Nachman from a braisa. The braisa states: The Chachamim say that the kometz requires a kli shares. How so? One must do the kemitzah with

a kli shares, make it holy with a kli shares, and offer it with a kli shares. Rabbi Shimon says: One did the kemitzah from a kli shares, he can bring it to the altar and burn it without a kli shares. (*This is a question on Rav Nachman who says that everyone agrees a kli shares is needed after the kemitzah*).

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Shimon means that once he did the kemitzah from a kli shares and sanctified the kemitzah with a kli shares, he can bring it to the altar and burn it without a kli shares.

The *Gemora* asks another question on Rav Nachman from a braisa. The braisa states: If he did the kemitzah with his right hand and then transferred it to his left hand, he should return it to his right hand. If when it was in his left hand he thought to eat it or offer it outside the allotted time or area, the sacrifice is invalid, but one who eats it is not liable to receive kares. If when it was in his right hand he thought to eat it or offer it outside the allotted area, the sacrifice is invalid, but one who eats it is not liable to receive kares. If he thought to eat it outside the allotted time, it is invalid and one who eats it is liable to receive kares. These are the words of Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon. The Chachamim say: Once he put it in his left hand, he made it invalid. Why do they say it is invalid? It must be because the kometz must be sanctified in a vessel. Being that it was put in his left hand, it is comparable to blood that of a sacrifice that fell from the neck of the animal to the floor which is gathered, and can no longer be sanctified with a vessel. It must be that Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon do not require for the kometz to be sanctified, which is why they say it is still valid. This is a strong question against Rav Nachman's statement, and proof to the statement of Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rabbi Chiya.

The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps this is also a question on Rabbi Yanai (*as the braisa says it should go back to his right hand, while Rabbi Yanai says he can even offer it with his belt*)?

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Yanai will say that he holds like the simple reading (*as opposed to how Rav Nachman*

understands the beraisa, as explained earlier) of the Tanna quoted earlier as saying that burning can be done with one's left hand.

The Mishna stated that if one offers the kometz twice (*in two parts*), it is valid.

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi states: Twice means not in three or four parts (*see Shita Mekubetzes note #11*). Rabbi Yochanan states: Twice means twice and even in many parts.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the (*crux of the*) difference between these opinions?

Rabbi Zeira answers: Their argument is regarding whether or not there is a kometz less than two kzaysim and whether or not one can burn less than a kzayis. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi holds that a kometz cannot be less than two kzaysim, and burning cannot be less than a kzayis (*which is why there can only be two burnings*). Rabbi Yochanan holds that a kometz can be less than two kzaysim and burning can be less than a kzayis.

It was taught: When does the kometz permit the rest of the minchah to be eaten? Rabbi Chanina states: This is when the fire starts to burn it (*even partially*). Rabbi Yochanan states: This is when most of it is being burned.

Rav Yehudah said to Rabah bar Rav Yitzchak: I will explain to you the reasoning behind Rabbi Yochanan's opinion. The verse states: *The smoke of the land rose up like the smoke of a furnace*. A furnace does not give off smoke until most of it is alight.

Rabin bar Rav Ada said to Rava: Your students say the following braisa in the name of Rav Amram. The braisa states: I only know that parts of sacrifices that are normally brought at night, such as limbs, can be brought at night. They are put on the altar at sundown, and burn the entire night. How do we know that sacrifices that are normally put on the altar

during the day, such as a kometz, frankincense, incense, minchas kohanim, minchas kohen moshiach, and the minchas nesachim should be put on the altar after sundown?

The *Gemora* interjects: What does the braisa mean? It starts off by saying these are brought during the day, and then says they are brought after sundown! Rather, it means that they can be put on the altar before sundown, and burn throughout the night.

The braisa continues: The verse, *this is the Torah of the olah* includes this practice.

The *Gemora* asks (*on Rabbi Yochanan*): If one puts such a sacrifice on the altar right before sundown, most of it will not be burned before sundown!

The *Gemora* answers: The braisa is referring to the sacrifice making it to the altar in time, so that it will not become invalid through linah (*not being placed on the altar in due time*). Rabbi Yochanan is referring to when the kometz permits the leftovers.

The *Gemora* notes: Rabbi Elazar understood the braisa indeed means after sundown, and that it is discussing parts of sacrifices that fall off the altar while being burned. These parts should be placed back onto the altar the entire night. When Rav Dimi arrived, he also gave this explanation in the name of Rabbi Yanai.

The *Gemora* asks: Does Rabbi Yanai indeed hold this way? Didn't Rabbi Yanai say that incense that flew off the altar, even small bits of it, should not be placed back on the altar?

Rav Chanina bar Minyumi the son of Rebbi (*see Shitah Mekubetzes*) taught that Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov states that the verse says, *that the fire will consume the olah on the altar*. This teaches that one should return burned pieces of olah to the altar, but not burned pieces of incense.

The *Gemora* answers: The word "incense" is not supposed to be in the text of the braisa (*regarding sundown*). (*The Chidushei Ha'Rashba explains that this is because incense is indeed something which is not put back on the altar. It is excluded from this verse regarding the olah, as incense is brought on the inner altar and not the outer altar. Other offerings, however, are not excluded from this verse.*)

Rav Asi says: When Rabbi Elazar learned Menachos, he would ask the following question. If a kometz was placed on the altar, and then the wood for the fire was placed on top of it (*and lit*), what is the law? Is this called a normal way of burning or not? The *Gemora* concludes in teiku.

Chizkiyah asked: If limbs were placed on the altar, and then the wood for the fire was placed on top of it (*and lit*), what is the law? Do we say that the verse states, *on the wood* and therefore the limbs must be on top of wood? Or do we say that being that the verse states, *that the fire will consume the olah on the altar* it can be done either way. The *Gemora* concludes in teiku. (26a - 26b)

DAILY MASHAL

When the Printer Turned Oil into Letters

A prior *Mishna* explains that someone who puts too much or too little oil on a *minchah* disqualifies it. In one of his works Rabbi Reuven Margaliyos, author of *Margaliyos HaYam*, points out an interesting fact. *Bayis Hagadol* cites this *Mishna* but because the printer wanted to abridge the text, he misread the words שמנה – שמנה and printed חסר ח' ריבה חסר ח' . About such an error it is said "if he abridged שמנה , it is disqualified".