

Menachos – Simanim

פרק א – כל המנחות

דף 5 – ה

1. Reish Lakish: **is** מנחת העומר שקמצה שלא לשמה

Reish Lakish says that a מנחת העומר whose קמיצה was performed שלא לשמה is valid, ושיריה אין נאכלין – *but its remainder may not be eaten* until another מנחת העומר is brought and permits it (since the עומר is brought from חדש, and the first עומר did not permit חדש). The Gemara asks, if the grain used in this מנחה remains forbidden in consumption, how can he offer it on the מזבח? But the *passuk* says: "ממשקה ישראל" – *from the feast of Yisroel*, teaching that *korbanos* must be brought לישראל – *from that which is permitted to Yisroel* for consumption!? Rav Adda bar Ahavah answers that Reish Lakish holds: אין מחוסר זמן לבו ביום – *there is no disqualification of prematurity for a korban* which will become permitted *that day*. Since this עומר's שירים will become permitted that day, when another עומר is brought, it is considered "ממשקה ישראל" even beforehand. This explanation is eventually refuted, and Rav Pappa answers instead that Reish Lakish holds: האיר מזרח מתי – *the illuminating of the eastern sky on the sixteenth of Nissan permits* the new grain in consumption, not the bringing of the עומר. It is merely a *mitzvah* not to eat the שירים until the עומר is properly brought, so the grain is considered "ממשקה ישראל".

2. Rava: **is** מנחת העומר שקמצה שלא לשמה may be eaten

Rava says that a מנחת העומר whose קמיצה was performed שלא לשמה, and its שירים may be eaten, and no other מנחת העומר is required to permit it. He explains that שלא לשמה intent is completely ineffective for the מנחת העומר – *because disqualifying intent is only effective by someone fit for the avodah*, – *and only in a place which is fit for avodah*. The Gemara explains each phrase: "Someone fit for *avodah*" excludes the intent of a בעל מום, who is unfit for *avodah*. "Something fit for the *avodah*" excludes intent about the מנחת העומר, which is not fit for any other type of offering, because it is an anomaly, since barley is not ordinarily acceptable as a מנחה. "A place fit for *avodah*" means to exclude המזבח - where the *mizbeiach* was damaged, teaching that פיגול intent while the מזבח was damaged and unfit for *avodah* is ineffective.

3. Why a טריפה's disqualification as a *korban* cannot be derived from בעל מום

A Baraisa *derashens* "מן הבקר" – *from the cattle* to exclude a *tereifah* from being used as a *korban*. The Baraisa asks that this should be derived from a *kal vachomer*: ומה בעל מום שמותרת להדיט – *if a blemished [animal], which is permitted in consumption for a commoner*, – *is forbidden for the "Most High"* (i.e., as a *korban*), then a טריפה, which is forbidden in consumption for a הדיוט, should certainly be forbidden as a *korban*!? The Baraisa explains why this *kal vachomer* cannot be disproven from חלב, דם, and מליקה, which are all permitted to despite being prohibited in consumption. It concludes: ואם השבתה – *and if you will respond* that the *kal vachomer* can be undermined, we have the above *derashah* which disqualifies טריפה. The Gemara attempts to identify the counterargument to the *kal vachomer*. Suggested proofs from מנחת העומר (which is חדש, and forbidden to a הדיוט), פטום הקטורת (which is forbidden to make for a הדיוט), Shabbos (forbidden for a הדיוט's מלאכה, but permitted for תמידין and מוספין), and כלאים (permitted in a Kohen's garments), are all rejected because מצותה בכך – *its commandment is such*, and cannot be performed otherwise. This discussion continues on the next Daf.

Siman – Hay

The two Kohanim on a **hay** ride made from barley from the field the עומר was cut from who were arguing if the שירים are eaten if the עומר was brought שלא לשמה, one saying you must wait for a new one to be brought and one saying it can be eaten as is, were being pulled by a טריפה whose disqualification for a *korban* cannot be learned out from his partner the בעל מום.

דף ה | DAF 5

Hay



The two Kohanim on a **hay ride** made from barley from the field the עומר was cut from who were **arguing** if the שיריים are eaten if the עומר was brought לשמה, one saying you must wait for a new one to be brought and one saying it can be eaten as is, were being pulled by a טריפה whose disqualification for a *korban* cannot be learned out from his partner the בעל מום.

3 things to remember

1. Reish Lakish: מנחת העומר שקמצה **כשר** is **שירה אין** **לאכלין**
2. Rava: מנחת העומר שקמצה **שירה אין** is **כשר** is **fully** **לאכלין**
3. Why a טריפה's disqualification as a *korban* cannot be derived from בעל מום

