

Menachos – Simanim

פרק ג – הקומץ רבה

דף כה – 25 Daf

1. The *ציץ* is *מרצה* for *tumah*, not for *יוצא*

The next Mishnah states that if the *kometz* became *tamei*, and the Kohen offered it (despite its being disqualified), the *ציץ* is *מרצה* – *effects acceptance* and the *שירים* may be eaten. However, if the *kometz* left the *עדה*, and the Kohen offered it, the *ציץ* is not *מרצה*, *הטמא על הטמא* – *because the ציץ effects acceptance for tumah*, *ואינו מרצה על* – *but does not effect acceptance for the disqualification for leaving the עדה*. A Baraisa analyzes the *passuk* describing where the *ציץ* is *מרצה*: "ונשא אהרן את עון הקדשים" – *and Aharon will bear the sin of the offering*. This cannot refer to *avodah* with intent of *למקומו* or *חוצ למזמו*, because these are both invalid. It must refer to the sin of *tumah*, *שהותרה מכללה בציבור* – *which has an exception to its general prohibition for a communal [korban]*, which may be brought in a state of *tumah*. It does not refer to *יוצא*, although it is permitted on a *במה*, because the *passuk* says "לפני ה'" – *before Hashem*, indicating the *ציץ* is only *מרצה* on an *ח' עון דלפני ה'* – *a sin before Hashem* (i.e., *tumah*, which is disqualified "before Hashem," inside the *עדה*), and not *יוצא*. The Gemara explains why it cannot refer to the disqualification of *שמאל* – *left-handed [avodah]*, or *בשל מום*.

2. Contradiction if the *ציץ* is *מרצה* for *מזיד*, *machlokes* about *קנס*

A Baraisa teaches that if blood of a *korban* became *tamei* (and was unfit for *זריקה*), and a Kohen performed *זריקה* with it, *בשוגג הורצה* – if it occurred *mistakenly*, [the *korban*] is *accepted* (through the *ציץ*) and its meat may be eaten; *במזיד לא הורצה* – if it was *intentional*, it is not *accepted* insofar as its meat is Rabbinically prohibited to eat. The Gemara asks that this contradicts another Baraisa, which teaches that the *ציץ* is *מרצה* on blood, meat, or *חלב* of a *korban* which became *tamei*, whether *בשוגג* or *במזיד* or *באונס* – *accidentally* or *ברצון* – *willingly*? Rav Chisda eventually answers that they reflect a *machlokes* Tannaim about whether a *מזיד* was penalized; the second Baraisa is Rebbe Eliezer, who taught that if one separates *terumah* from *tamei* produce on *tahor* produce (which is prohibited), even intentionally, the *terumah* is valid (although *terumah* is not as strict as *kodashim*, we presume he holds the same for *kodashim*). [The Baraisa cannot be Rebbe Yose, who also holds *מזיד* was not penalized, because the second Baraisa says the *ציץ* is also *מרצה* for *tamei meat*, and Rebbe Yose holds the *ציץ* is not *מרצה* for "אכילות" – [parts of the *korban*] which are eaten.]

3. Distinguishing between *מזיד* and *טומאה במזיד* *זריקה במזיד*

Ravina answers the above contradiction differently: *טומאתו בין בשוגג בין במזיד הורצה* – regarding its contracting *tumah*, whether it occurred *mistakenly* or *intentionally*, it is *accepted*. However, *זריקתו בשוגג הורצה במזיד לא הורצה* – Regarding its *זריקה*, if it was done *mistakenly*, it is *accepted*, but if it was done *intentionally*, it is not *accepted*. Thus, the first Baraisa, which distinguishes between *מזיד* and *שוגג*, is discussing how the *זריקה* was performed, whereas the second Baraisa, which says even "מזיד" is *accepted*, is referring to how it became *tamei*. Rav Shila makes the *opposite* distinction: regarding its *זריקה*, whether it was performed *בשוגג* or *במזיד*, the *korban* is *accepted*, but regarding how it became *tamei*, if it occurred *בשוגג*, it is *accepted*, but if it occurred *במזיד*, it is not *accepted*. He therefore explains the first Baraisa to be discussing how it became *tamei*, and the second Baraisa to be discussing how the *זריקה* was performed.

Siman – Silver Anniversary (Celebrating 25 Years)

The twenty fifth wedding anniversary dinner at the Tzitz themed restaurant where *מנחות* dishes were still served if the *kometz* was *טמא*, not if it was *יוצא*, was a disaster when a waiter intentionally threw *tamei* blood at the mock *mizbeiach* thinking he could still serve the meat but was told by the maître de that he couldn't since the *ציץ* is only *מרצה* for *מזיד* and *טומאה במזיד*, not *זריקה במזיד*.

דף כה | DAF 25

Silver Anniversary (Celebrating 25 Years)



The **twenty fifth wedding anniversary** dinner at the Tzitz themed restaurant where **מנחות** dishes were still served if the **kometz** was טמא, not if it was יוצא, was a disaster when a waiter **intentionally** threw **tamei** blood at the mock **mizbeiach** thinking he could still serve the meat but was told by the maître de that he couldn't since the ציץ is only מרצה for זריקה במזיד, טומאה במזיד, not זריקה במזיד.

3 things to remember

1. The ציץ is מרצה for **tumah**, not for יוצא
2. Contradiction if the ציץ is מרצה for מזיד, **machlokes** about קנס
3. Distinguishing between טומאה במזיד and זריקה במזיד

