

6 Elul 5778  
August 17, 2018



Menachos Daf 7

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

### **Vessel Sanctifying**

The *Gemora* asks: By the fact that Rabbi Yochanan said that a vessel does not sanctify (*that which is placed into it*) unless there is intent (*and therefore, where the disqualified person did not intend to sanctify the komeitz when he returned it to its original vessel, it will not sanctify it*), this would imply that if he would have had intent, it would have sanctified it! But Rish Lakish inquired of Rabbi Yochanan whether service vessels sanctify invalid items, and Rabbi Yochanan replied that they do not!?

The *Gemora* answers that Rabbi Yochanan meant only that they are not sanctified enough to be offered on the altar; however, they are sanctified to the level that they become disqualified.

Rav Amram answers the original question (*as to why when a disqualified person returns the komeitz to its original vessel, it does not sanctify it*): It is referring to a case where he returned it to a heaped vessel (*and it cannot become sanctified, for it is above the rim*).

The *Gemora* asks: If so, how did he perform the *kemitzah* in the first place (*the flour must be contained inside the vessel*)!?

Rather, the *Gemora* answers: He returned it to a vessel where the flour was rounded (*so the kemitzah was done with flour below the rim, but when it was returned, it remained above the rim*).

The *Gemora* asks: But when he performed the *kemitzah*, he formed a hole in the flour; so upon returning the *komeitz*, it is inside the vessel (*when it goes back into the hole; accordingly, it should become sanctified*)!?

The *Gemora* answers: When he returned it, he placed it on the sides of the vessel and then he shook it so that it fell by itself into the (*hole in the flour in the*) vessel; and it is as if it were put there by a monkey (*which is why it doesn't become sanctified*).

Rabbi Yirmiyah asked Rabbi Zeira: Why not suggest that he placed it back into a vessel which was resting on the ground? We can then infer from this (*that we refrained from giving such a suggestion*) that one may perform a *kemitzah* from a vessel which is resting on the ground (*and that a vessel resting on the ground may sanctify that which is placed in it*)!

He replied: You are now touching upon a question that we addressed, for Avimi was studying Tractate Menachos at the school of Rav Chisda, and ...

The *Gemora* interjects: But did Avimi study by Rav Chisda? Did not Rav Chisda say: I received many blows from Avimi because (*I forgot*) the following subject: If the Court announces the sale of the (*orphan's*) property daily, it needs to be done for thirty days; if it is only being announced on Mondays and Thursdays, it must be done for sixty days! [*Evidently, Rav Chisda studied by Avimi, and not the other way around!*?]



The *Gemora* answers: Avimi had forgotten this Tractate and went to Rav Chisda that he might be reminded of his teachings.

The *Gemora* asks: Why did Avimi not send for him, that he (Rav Chisda) should come to him?

The *Gemora* answers: He thought that in this way, he would accomplish more.

The *Gemora* returns to the discussion: Rav Nachman once met Avimi and asked him: How does one perform a *kemitzah*? He replied: Out of this vessel (*which was resting on the ground*). Rav Nachman asked him: And may one perform a *kemitzah* from a vessel that is resting on the ground? He replied: Another *Kohen* must lift it up.

Rav Nachman asked him further: And how does one sanctify the *komeitz* that was taken from the *minchah* offering? Avimi replied: One should place it into this vessel (*which was resting on the ground*). Rav Nachman asked him: And may one sanctify the *komeitz* using a vessel that is resting on the ground? He replied: Another *Kohen* must lift it up.

Rav Nachman observed: Then you require three *Kohanim* (*one to perform the kemitzah and two to hold the vessels*). Avimi replied: And it would be fine if thirteen are required – just like the daily *tamid* offering.

Rav Nachman asked from the following *Mishna*: This is the general rule: if one performed the *kemitzah* or placed it into the vessel or brought it near or burned it – with the intention to eat something that it is usual to eat outside of its place (*it is disqualified but there is no kares; however, if he had a "beyond its time" intent, it is piggul and there is kares*) etc. Now, there is no mention here of lifting up the vessel! [*Seemingly this is because there is no necessity to raise the vessel off the ground!?*]

The *Gemora* answers: The *Tanna* is merely teaching the order of the various services, but not the amount of *Kohanim* (*although it may quite possible be that an improper intent during the raising of the vessel can invalidate the offering*).

They inquired of Rav Sheishes: Can the *kemitzah* be performed from a vessel which is resting on the ground? He replied: Go and see what is done inside the Sanctuary: Four *Kohanim* entered in (*on Shabbos*), two of them had in their hands the two arrangements of loaves (*each one carrying six loaves*), and the other two had in their hands the two spoons of *levonah* (*frankincense*); and four *Kohanim* went in before them. Two of them removed the two arrangements of loaves (*which were on the shulchan - table*), and two of them removed the two spoons. Now, there is no mention here of lifting up the *shulchan* (*at the time when the levonah was removed; the removal of the levonah permits the breads to be eaten just as the komeitz permits the remainder of the minchah*)! [*Seemingly this is because there is no necessity to raise the shulchan off the ground!?*]

And if you will answer (*like above*) that The *Tanna* is merely teaching the order of the various (*significant*) services (*and the raising of the shulchan is not significant*); it is not comparable, for here, the *Tanna* specifically mentioned the amount of *Kohanim* necessary for the service!?! [*Why, then, did he omit the Kohen who raised the shulchan?*] Evidently, it is a proof from here that one may perform the *kemitzah* from a vessel which is resting on the ground. This is indeed a proof!

Rava said: It is obvious to me that one may perform a *kemitzah* from a vessel resting on the ground, for so we find regarding the removal of the spoons (*that is done while the shulchan is on the ground*). It is also obvious that one may sanctify the *minchah* by placing it in a vessel that is resting on the ground, for so we find regarding the arranging of the spoons. Rava inquired: May one sanctify the *komeitz* by placing it in a vessel that is resting on the ground? Do we derive this from the *minchah* itself, or perhaps we derive it from (*the accepting of the*) blood (*since these two services*



correspond to each other; and the accepting of the blood cannot be done with a vessel resting on the ground)? He then resolved it that it is derived from blood.

The *Gemora* asks: Did Rava actually say like this? But it was stated: If the *komeitz* was divided and placed into two vessels,

Rav Nachman says that it is not sanctified; and Rava says that it is. Now if it is true (that Rava derives the sanctification of the *minchah* from that of blood), then this too he should derive from the blood (where the *halachah* is that one must not accept the blood of the goats and the bulls in two vessels)?

The *Gemora* answers: Rava retracted from that opinion (and agreed to Rav Nachman).

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* proving that the blood cannot be sanctified in halves: Rav Tachlifa ben Shaul taught: If one sanctified less than the quantity required for sprinkling (of the purification water used for the *parah adumah*) in one vessel and again less than the quantity required for sprinkling in another vessel, the sanctification is not valid (even if he subsequently mixed them together). And they inquired: How is it with regard to blood? [Must one accept the minimum amount in one vessel, or may he accept it in two?] Is the law regarding the water a *Halachah l'Moshe mi'Sinai*, and therefore one may not derive anything from it; or is it so there because it is written: *And he shall dip it in the water (which we derive from there that "the water" must be accepted in one vessel)*; then here also it is written: *And he shall dip his finger into the blood?* And it was stated: Rabbi Zerika said in the name of Rabbi Elozar: Even in regarding the blood it is not sanctified.

Rava said: We have learned a *braisa* like that: It is written (with respect to the bull of the Anointed Kohen): *And he shall dip* – and he shall not wipe on the side of the vessel; *in the blood* - there must be at the very beginning sufficient blood

in one vessel for dipping; *from the blood* - from the blood spoken of in the context.

The *Gemora* notes: And the expressions '*and he shall dip*' and '*in the blood*' are both necessary. For had the Torah stated, only '*and he shall dip*,' I might have said that it is valid even though at the very beginning there was not sufficient blood in one vessel for dipping; it therefore stated: '*In the blood*.' And had the Torah stated only, '*in the blood*,' I might have said that he may even wipe on the side of the vessel; it therefore stated: '*and he shall dip*.' *From the blood* - from the blood spoken of in the context. This excludes the blood that remains on the *Kohen's* finger. This supports Rabbi Elozar who said that the blood remaining on his finger is not valid for sprinkling. (7a – 7b)

#### DAILY MASHAL

##### ***Old-time Modernization***

Our *Gemora* recounts that Avimi forgot tractate *Menachos* and therefore turned to his pupil Rav Chisda to learn it. The *Gemora* explains that he didn't summon his pupil but took the trouble to go to him as he thought that his trouble would help him to remember his learning, as the saying goes: "If you toiled and found, believe" (see Rashi). We find a similar example in *Leket Yosher* (II, p. 94), where the pupil of the *Terumas HaDeshen* recounts: "I remember that he said, "Those rich, spoiled boys who made themselves special tables (revolving bookshelves) – while they sit, they turn the table where they want with many *seforim*. They do not behave well. On the contrary, if one seeks a *sefer* and fetches it with much trouble, one remembers by that act what one wants to learn."