



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Menachos Daf Tes

- We have learned, if the mincha was mixed with oil outside the Azarah, **R' Yochanan** says it is passul and **Reish Lakish** says it is valid. **Reish Lakish** says it is valid, based on the pasuk that first says "V'yatzak aleha shemen v'nossan aleha levonah" and later says "Veheviya ehl bnei Aharon hakohanim v'kamatz". This teaches that from the kemitza and on all must be done by a Kohen. This means that the pouring of the oil and mixing may even be done by a non-Kohen. Since it doesn't require Kehuna, it also doesn't need to be done in the Azarah. **R' Yochanan** says it is passul, because the mixing must be done in a kli shareis. So, although it doesn't require a Kohen, it does require that it be done in the Azarah. There is a Braisa that says like **R' Yochanan**.
- We have learned, if the mincha became deficient before the kemitza, **R' Yochanan** says we can bring more flour from elsewhere to complete the measure, and **Reish Lakish** says we may not do that. **R' Yochanan** says we may do so, because the kemitza is what establishes it as a mincha, and therefore, before that point the mincha is not considered as deficient and we can add new flour. **Reish Lakish** says that the putting it into a keili establishes it as a mincha.
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** asked **Reish Lakish**, the Mishna regarding the metzora's oil says that if it became deficient before it was poured, he may add more oil to it. Now, this is so even though it was already in a keili!? **TEYUFTA** of **Reish Lakish**.
- We have learned, if the remaining flour of a mincha became deficient between the kemitza and the burning of the kometz, **R' Yochanan** says he may still burn the kometz and **Reish Lakish** says that he may not.
 - They would both agree that according to **R' Eliezer** the kometz should be burned, because he says in a Mishna that even if all the remaining flour was lost the kometz is burned. The machlokes is according to **R' Yehoshua**, who says that if all the remaining flour is lost the kometz is not burned. **Reish Lakish** says that **R' Yehoshua** would say the same thing even when only some of the remaining flour is missing. **R' Yochanan** says that **R' Yehoshua** says it should be burned. In the Mishna he says it is not burned only because *all* of the flour was missing.
 - We see this concept (that there is a difference between some of the flour missing and all of the flour missing) in a Braisa, where **R' Yehoshua** says regarding an animal korbon whose meat and cheilev are missing, that as long as there is a kezayis that remains, the zrika may still be done. Presumably, he would say the same thing regarding a mincha, that as long as some of the flour remains, the mincha remains valid.
 - **Reish Lakish** would say that a mincha is different than an animal korbon, because the pasuk says "**hamincha**", which teaches that unless the entire mincha is there, the kometz may not be burned. **R' Yochanan** says the pasuk says "**min hamincha**", which teaches that as long as the mincha *was* complete at the time of the kemitza it remains valid even if it then became deficient.
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** asked **Reish Lakish**, a Braisa says that if the Lechem Hapanim broke after it was removed from the Shulchan (which is the equivalent of the kemitza), its levonah (which is the equivalent of the kometz) may be burned. This means, that if it becomes deficient after the kemitza it does not become passul. This refutes **Reish Lakish**!? **A: Reish Lakish** said, this Braisa follows **R' Eliezer**.
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** asked, I stated an anonymous Mishna, and you are saying that it only follows **R' Eliezer**!? If the Mishna follows **R' Eliezer**, it should not just give the case where the Lechem Hapanim broke (and

was missing some), but should rather give the case of where it became totally destroyed!? **Reis Lakish** remained quiet.

- **Q:** Why did he remain quiet? Why didn't he say that a korbon of the tzibbur (like the Lechem Hapanim) is different, in that since tumah is mutar for them, they are also mutar even if they are deficient!? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** said, from the fact that this answer was not given we can learn that a deficient mincha is like a baal mum, and just as a baal mum is not mutar for a korbon of the tzibbur, a deficient mincha would also not be mutar.
 - **R' Pappa** was repeating this and **R' Yosef** said to him, aren't **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** even discussing the Omer mincha, and yet they still argue? Therefore, **Reish Lakish** could not have answered that the korbon of a tzibbur is different.
- **Q: R' Malkiyo** asked, two Braisos each give a pasuk to teach that a deficient mincha is passul. Now, why are two pesukim needed to teach this? Presumably, one is to teach regarding a mincha that became deficient before the kemitza and one is to teach regarding where it became deficient between the kemitza and the burning of the kometz. This refutes **R' Yochanan** on both points!? **A:** That is not what the two pesukim come to teach. Rather, one pasuk teaches that if a mincha becomes deficient before the kemitza, if he brings more flour to complete the mincha it will be valid, and if he does not it will not be valid. The other pasuk teaches that if the leftover flour became deficient between the kemitza and the burning of the kometz, even if he then burns the kometz, the leftover flour may not be eaten.
 - This last ruling is actually the subject of a machlokes between **Ze'iri**, who says that the leftover flour may not be eaten in this case, and **R' Yannai**, who says that it may be eaten.

KAMATZ BISMOL...

- **Q:** How do we know this? **A: R' Zeira** said, the pasuk says "Vayakreiv es hamincha vayimlaei kapo mimena". In another pasuk regarding the metzora's oil the pasuk says that the Kohen should pour it on the "left kaf" of another Kohen. This shows that when referring to the left, the pasuk is explicit in saying so. This means that the word "kapo" or "kaf" on its own refers to the right hand.
 - **Q:** The pasuk regarding metzora is needed to teach for the metzora process, and can't be used to teach elsewhere!? **A:** The word "smalis" (left) is written a second time.
 - **Q:** Maybe say that an exclusion followed by an exclusion comes to *include*, and therefore two mentions of the left hand come to include that even the Kohen's right hand may be used for this as well? **A:** There is a third mention of "smalis", which can be used to teach elsewhere.
 - **Q:** Maybe the extra "smalis" teaches that every mention of "kaf" refers only to the left hand? **A:** There is a fourth mention of the word "smalis". This extra time teaches that all other mentions of "kaf" refer to the right hand.
 - **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked **R' Zeira**, why does the pasuk explicitly say (twice, once in regard to the wealthy metzora and once in regard to the poor metzora) that the oil of the metzora should be put on his right thumb and right big toe, when it already said that the oil should be put on the blood, which itself was already put on his right thumb and right big toe!? **A:** One of these pesukim is needed to teach that the sides of the thumbs are valid for putting of the oil, and one is needed to teach that the bottom of the thumbs are not valid.
 - **Q:** What do the two pesukim (once in regard to the wealthy metzora and once in regard to the poor metzora) that say that the oil should be placed on the blood teach? **A:** One pasuk says "on the blood of the asham". If we would only have had that, we would think that if the blood had already been wiped off the oil can no longer be applied there. Therefore we need the second pasuk of "on

the place of the blood". If we only had this second pasuk, we would have thought that the oil may only be applied if the blood had been wiped off, but if the blood was still there we would say that it acts as a chatzitz. We therefore also need the pasuk of "on the blood".