



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

Menachos Daf Yud Ches

- **Q:** The Gemara just said that **R' Yehuda** holds that if one brings a korbon with intent to leave over some of the blood for the next day, all would agree (the **Rabanan and R' Eliezer**) that it would be passul. The Gemara asks, from the conversation between **R' Elazar ben Shamu'ah** and **Yosef Habavli** in a Braisa we can learn that **R' Yehuda** told **Yosef Habavli** that it is actually a machlokes between the **Rabanan and R' Eliezer** in the case of intent to leave the blood over until the next day!? **A:** The Gemara says that the Braisa can be understood even if **R' Yehuda** holds that all would agree in that case.

MISHNA

- If the Kohen did not pour the oil onto the mincha (after having already placed oil into the keili before placing the flour into it, and after having then poured more oil onto the flour and mixed it, he did not do the 3rd pouring of oil onto the already mixed mincha), or if he did not mix the oil with the mincha (i.e. the second pouring of oil), or if he did not break any of the baked menachos into pieces (but rather only broke enough to allow him to take a kometz), or if he did not salt the mincha before burning it, or if he did not do tenufa, or did not bring it to the southwest corner of the Mizbe'ach ("hagasha"), or if he broke the mincha into pieces that are larger than how they are supposed to be broken, or if he did not smear oil on the mincha (if it is of the type of mincha that is supposed to have that done, e.g. rekikin), the mincha is valid.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What does the Mishna mean that he did not pour oil onto the mincha? If it means that it was not poured at all, it would be passul, because that is essential to the korbon!? **A:** Rather, it means that the pouring was done by a non-Kohen.
 - **Q:** If so, when the Mishna lists the case of the mincha which was not mixed with oil it must also refer to the case of where it was mixed by a non-Kohen. This would suggest that if the mincha was not mixed at all it would be passul. However, a Mishna suggests that as long as a mincha could be mixed it is valid even if it was not mixed!? **A:** Each part of the Mishna refers to a different set of circumstances. The part discussing the pouring of the oil refers to where it was done by a non-Kohen (and that is where the Mishna says it is valid) and the part that discusses mixing refers to where it was not mixed at all (and the Mishna teaches that even there it is valid).

OY SHEPSASAN PITIM MERUBOS K'SHEIRA

- **Q:** The Mishna has already said that if he did not break the mincha at all it is valid, so why did it have to teach that if he broke it into pieces that are larger, they are valid? **A:** The Mishna doesn't mean that he broke it into large pieces, rather it means that he broke it into many more pieces than he should have (so that each piece is smaller than it should have been). **A2:** The Mishna means that he broke them into pieces that were larger than they should have been. However, we would have thought that when he doesn't break them at all the korbon is valid because they have the status of "challos", but when they are broken into the wrong size they don't have the status of "challos" or of "psitim" and should therefore be passul.
- **Q:** Our Mishna seems not to follow **R' Shimon**, who lists in a Braisa the avodos that must be done by a Kohen, and includes the pouring of the oil in that list!? **A:** **R' Nachman** said, the Braisa is referring to the mincha of a Kohen and the Mishna is referring to the mincha of a non-Kohen. The mincha of a non-Kohen has kemitza done, and it is from the kemitza and forward that a Kohen is required, which means that a Kohen is not required for the pouring and the mixing. The mincha of a Kohen does not have kemitza done, and it is therefore from the very beginning (even for pouring and mixing) that a Kohen is required.

- **Q: Rava** asked, we learn that a Kohen's mincha requires pouring of the oil onto it from the fact that a non-Kohen's mincha requires that. If so, we should say that just as the mincha of non-Kohen can have the pouring done by a non-Kohen, the pouring for the mincha of a Kohen should also be able to be done by a non-Kohen!? If so, when **R' Shimon** says it must be done by a Kohen, he would refer even to the mincha of a non-Kohen and must argue with our Mishna!? **A:** We must say that **R' Shimon** argues with our Mishna.