

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Kemitzah by a non-kohen (cont.)

The Gemara continues the exchange regarding the logic of those who maintain that once the kemitzah was placed into the second sacred utensil it is invalid.

R' Amram offers a second explanation why a kemitzah taken by a disqualified person does not become sanctified when he returns it to its original utensil.

This explanation is challenged and consequently revised.

The revised answer is unsuccessfully challenged.

2) Taking a kemitzah from a utensil resting on the ground

R' Yirmiyah infers from the previous discussion that it is permitted to take the kemitzah from a utensil that is resting on the ground.

R' Zeira retells an interaction between Avimi and R' Nachman that relates to this issue.

Tangentially, the Gemara wonders whether Avimi studied in R' Chisda's yeshiva.

R' Sheishes was asked whether one is allowed to take the kemitzah from a utensil on the ground.

R' Sheishes demonstrated that it is valid.

This proof is unsuccessfully challenged.

Rava presents some obvious halachos and then asks whether one may sanctify the kemitzah in a utensil that is on the floor.

After elaborating on the question Rava answers that someone must be holding the utensil.

Rava's position on this matter is unsuccessfully challenged.

3) Sanctifying blood in halves

R' Tachlifa ben Shaul cites a Baraisa and subsequent discussion that blood cannot be sanctified in halves.

Rava quotes a Baraisa that supports R' Elazar's ruling that was cited in the previous discussion.

The Gemara explains why it was necessary for the Baraisa to present two expositions.

Rava clarifies the Baraisa's third ruling and this explanation supports a statement made by R' Elazar.

Two unsuccessful challenges to Rava's position are recorded.

4) Receiving less blood than the minimum amount

The Gemara begins to question whether, in fact, according to R' Elazar, blood is not sanctified if less than the minimum amount is gathered in a single utensil. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Sanctifying the minchah and kemitzah in a vessel on the ground

מקדשין מנחה בכלי שעל גבי קרקע שכן מצינו בסידור בזיכין

Rava made a statement regarding removing the kemitzah and its placement into a holy service vessel while the vessels are sitting on the ground. Rava begins by noting that the removal of the two spoons of levonah (בזיכי לבונה) off the shulchan each week is done while the shulchan is on the ground. Rava considers the lechem hapanim and the spoons of levonah to be like the minchah with its kemitzah and remaining flour. The removal of spoon of levonah from the shulchan and the lechem hapanim is parallel to the taking of the kemitzah from the collection of flour designated for a minchah. Just as the spoons of levonah are removed while the shulchan is on the ground, so too we learn that it is acceptable to remove the kemitzah while the vessel containing the minchah is on the ground. Similarly, the original placement of a minchah may be done into a vessel which is on the ground, just as we find that the lechem hapanim and the spoons of levonah is done while the shulchan is on the ground.

With these two observations and their correlating conclusions, Rava advances a question regarding the kemitzah itself after it is removed, and whether it may be placed into a sanctified service vessel which is on the ground. Rava subsequently resolved this question and he determined that the vessel which sanctifies the kemitzah must be held in the hands of another kohen and it cannot be sitting on the ground.

The Achronim note that from the Gemara and Rashi later (8a) we see that the levonah which is placed on the shulchan is not sanctified by the shulchan, but rather by the spoons into which they are placed. The spoons themselves are then placed onto the shulchan, together with the lechem hapanim loaves.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. Does a sacred utensil sanctify its contents automatically?
2. Why did Avimi travel to study Menachos with R' Chisda his student?
3. What is the basis of Rava's uncertainty whether the kemitzah could be placed in a sacred utensil that rests on the ground?
4. Why is it necessary for the Torah to use the word **וטבל** and the word **בדם**?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Rabbi and Mrs. Sam Biber
In memory of their father
ר' משה בצלאל בן ר' יעקב הלוי, ע"ה

HALACHAH Highlight

Using depilatory to remove one's פיאות

מנח ליה אדפנא דמנא ומניד ליה ונפל ממילא

He put it on the side of the utensil and shook the utensil so that it fell on its own

Poskim dispute the nature of the prohibition against cutting one's pe'os. Rambam¹ maintains that the prohibition is violated only when one cuts off all of one's pe'os with a razor whereas Rosh² maintains that cutting off all of one's pe'os with a scissors also violates the Biblical prohibition. Shulchan Aruch³ mentions both opinions and writes that one should be stringent in accordance with both opinions. Sefer Toras Eretz Yisroel⁴ raises the question of whether it is permitted for one to use a depilatory; is the use of a depilatory similar in character to a scissors and Biblically prohibited according to Rosh or not? The core of the question is whether the removal of the pe'os with such a cream is traced back to the one who put the cream in place and he is considered to have removed the pe'os, or perhaps the cream is what removes the hair and the one who put the cream in place is only an indirect cause of the destruction of the pe'os and as such he is Biblically exempt. One possible proof (See Menachos 56b) that it is his action is that if one places sourdough on a minchah loaf and it becomes chometz he is given lashes. The dough became chometz on its own and nevertheless the Gemara considers it as though it is his action.

Teshuvos Dvar Yehoshua⁵ asserts that any act that a person does not do directly is considered indirect (גרמא) even if it is the result of his force. Furthermore, any action that happens on its own, even if a person prepared the conditions for this action to occur, is also considered indirect and is not traced back to that

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Although it might be possible to say that the intent of the Gemara later is that the lechem hapanim is sanctified by the shulchan, and not the levonah, it is can be argued that the lechem hapanim is actually sanctified as it is baked in an oven, and not by the shulchan. The sanctification of the lechem hapanim in the oven can be the source from where we see that a vessel may be on the ground as it sanctifies the commodity placed into it.

Chidushei HaGri"z explains that although the oven sanctifies the lechem hapanim, and the spoons sanctify the levonah, this sanctification is only limited to one of designation (קדושת הכשר), rather than being an intrinsic sanctification (קדושת קרבן). For example, the levonah may now be placed on the shulchan, but it is not sanctified to be brought on the Altar to permit the loaves. The levonah is not yet a full minchah until it is also placed on the shulchan. This, then, is the proof of the Gemara, as it notes that although there was a degree of designation of holiness to the levonah in the spoons, it is only completed when they are placed on the shulchan, which is on the floor. ■

person. Proof to this position is found in our Gemara. The Gemara teaches that if one puts the kemitzah on the side of the utensil and then shakes the utensil causing the kemitzah to fall into place it is not considered as though he put the kemitzah in the utensil and it is not yet sanctified. Even though he put the flour on the utensil and shook the utensil it is still not considered his direct action. ■

1. רמב"ם פי"ב מהל' עכו"ם ה"ו.

2. רא"ש מכות פי"ג סי' ב' וגי'.

3. שו"ע יו"ד סי' קפ"א סעי' ג'.

4. ספר תורת ארץ ישראל סי' י"ד.

5. שו"ת דבר יהושע ח"ג יו"ד סי' כ"ח אות ו' וז'.

STORIES Off the Daf

Exertion for Torah

"הכי מסתייעא מילתא טפי..."

Rav Yisrael Freidman, shlit"א, encouraged those who have a hard time toiling in Torah with the following words. "Our sages tell us that if someone claims that he has found Torah, יגעת ומצאתי, believe him. But if he claims that he has attained the Torah without toil, don't believe him. Yet not everyone is able to learn Torah in an analytical or deep manner. How can such people acquire Torah which can only be attained through the expenditure of

much effort?

"The answer to this question can be extracted from the Gemara in Menachos 7. There we find that when Avimi forgot Meseches Menachos he went to Rav Chisda to learn it again. The Gemara asks – why didn't he call Rav Chisda to come to him? It replies that Avimi understood that if he went to Rav Chisda the effort he put forth going to Rav Chisda would aid him in relearning the forgotten tractate. Rashi explains that this is because of יגעתי ומצאתי תאמין. We see that there is another way to obtain Torah which can be done by anyone: working hard by going out of one's way to learn whenever possible and as well as he can.

"This is why Rav Isser Zalman Meltzer, zt"l, and other greats were always particular to get the seforim necessary for the shiur themselves. They knew that even the exertion of getting up and obtaining a necessary sefer would help them to achieve more and deeper understanding of Torah."¹

Rav Shamai Ginsburg, zt"l, made a similar comment to someone who expressed regret that some of his questions to the Rav had embarrassed him publicly. "I am actually glad of this, since shame is an excellent way to attain more success in learning, as we find in Menachos 7..."² ■

1. שבט מישראל, ע' ר"כ

2. אמרי שמאי, ח"ב, ע' קל"ג