



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

Menachos Daf Chuf Gimmel

- If oil was put into a chatas mincha, **R' Yochanan** says it is passul and **Reish Lakish** says it is valid, since a chatas mincha is anyway supposed to have some oil rubbed into it.
 - **Q:** The pasuk regarding the chatas mincha says that oil should not be put on it!? **A:** That means that it is not to get the amount of oil as other menachos get.
 - **Q:** **R' Yochanan** asked **Reish Lakish**, a Braisa says, if a dry mincha became mixed with a mincha that has oil, it may still be offered. **R' Yehuda** says it may not be offered. Presumably this is talking about a chatas mincha that was mixed with another mincha, and the only reason the **T"K** says it may be offered is because it is oil of another korbon, which itself is to be offered on the Mizbe'ach (and things that go onto the Mizbe'ach are not mevatel each other). This suggests that if the chatas mincha had some other oil added to it, it would be passul even according to the **T"K**!? **A:** The Braisa is not discussing the chatas mincha. It is discussing a case of where the mincha accompanying a bull or ram became mixed with the mincha accompanying a lamb (which has more oil per amount of flour).
 - **Q:** The Braisa first explicitly discusses the menachos that accompany bulls, rams, and lambs, and then discusses a dry and oiled mincha, so that can't refer to the menachos of the bull, ram, and lamb!? **A:** The Braisa first states the case and then gives the reason why the menachos of bulls, rams, and lambs that mix are a problem – it is because those of the bull and ram are considered to be dry, whereas the mincha of a lamb is more oily.
- **Q: Rava** asked, if the oil of a kometz was squeezed out onto wood and that wood was then burned along with it on the Mizbe'ach, is the kometz considered to be missing oil? Do we say that the attachment of things that are going up on the Mizbe'ach makes them to be considered like one unit and therefore the kometz and the oil are still one, or do we not say that?
 - **Q: Ravina** said to **R' Ashi**, we can say that this is the subject of a machlokes between **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish**. We have learned that if someone offers a korbon outside the Mikdash, but there is less than a kezayis of meat, but with the bone that it is attached to there is a kezayis, **R' Yochanan** says he is chayuv, because things attached to the korbon have the status of the korbon itself, and **Reish Lakish** says he is patur, because things attached to the korbon do not have the status of the korbon itself. This seems to be the issue addressed by **Rava**! **A: R' Ashi** said, the question can be asked according to **R' Yochanan**, because it may be that he only holds that a bone and meat are considered attached, since they come from the same animal, but oil and flour would not be considered as one unit. The question can also be asked according to **Reish Lakish**, because he may only hold that a bone and meat are not considered one unit, since the bone is not supposed to be offered along with the meat. However, the oil and flour are supposed to be offered together, and so maybe they would be considered to become attached as one unit.
 - The Gemara remains with a **TEIKU**.

MISHNA

- If two menachos became mixed with each other before their kemitzos were taken, if a kometz can still be taken from each one separately, they are valid. If not, they are passul.
- If a kometz became mixed with a mincha that had not yet had its kometz taken, the mixture should not be offered on the Mizbe'ach. If it was offered, the owners of the mincha which had the kometz taken have fulfilled their obligation. The owners of the mincha that did not have the kometz taken have not fulfilled their obligation.

- If the kometz of a mincha became mixed with its shirayim, or with the shirayim of another mincha, the mixture should not be offered on the Mizbe'ach. If it was offered, the owner of the kometz has fulfilled his obligation.

GEMARA

- **R' Chisda** said, neveila meat becomes batul in a larger amount of shechted meat, because the shechted meat cannot become tamei like neveila meat (and they are therefore considered to be of unlike kinds). Shechted meat does not become batul in a larger amount of neveila meat, because neveila can lose its tumah when it spoils and becomes like the shechted meat (they are therefore of like kind, which does not become batul according to **R' Yehuda**). **R' Chanina** says, if the minority can become like the majority it is not batul (they are considered to be like kind), but if it can't, it becomes batul (this is the opposite of what **R' Chisda** said).
 - **Q:** According to whose view do they argue? They can't be arguing according to the **Rabanan**, because they say that anything brought on the Mizbe'ach are not mevatel each other, but things of like kind can be mevatel each other. They also can't be arguing according to **R' Yehuda**, because **R' Yehuda** looks to the physical appearance of the items in the mixture to decide whether they are like kind, and in both these cases the meats in the mixture look the same and would therefore be of like kind!? **A:** It is according to **R' Chiya**, who taught a Braisa that says that neveila meat and shechted meat are mevatel one another.
 - **Q:** Who does this anonymous Braisa of **R' Chiya** follow? It can't follow the **Rabanan or R' Yehuda**, for the reasons explained above!? **A:** It follows the view of **R' Yehuda**, because he holds that like kind are not mevatel each other only when it is possible for one to take on the characteristics of the other (in addition to like physical appearance). Based on this, the machlokes above is that **R' Chisda** says we look to the majority in making this determination, and **R' Chanina** says we look to the minority.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from our Mishna. The Mishna said, if two menachos became mixed with each other before their kemitzos were taken, if a kometz can still be taken from each one separately, they are valid. If not, they are passul. Now, once he takes the kometz from one, the rest of that mincha becomes shirayim, and it seems that the shirayim would not be mevatel the other mincha (in a case where the shirayim is the majority of the mixture). Now, this can't follow the **Rabanan**, because they say that only things that are brought onto the Mizbe'ach don't become batel, but like kind things can become batel (and the shirayim is not brought up onto the Mizbe'ach, so it should be mevatel). It must follow **R' Yehuda**. Now, according to **R' Chanina** this makes sense, because the minority (the mincha from which the kometz was not yet taken) can become like the majority (the shirayim) when its kometz is taken, and therefore it is considered to be like kind, which is why it does not become batel. However, according to **R' Chisda**, the majority cannot become like the minority, so they should be considered of unlike kind, and it should become batel!? Maybe we should say that our Mishna does not follow **R' Chisda or R' Chiya**? **A:** We can answer based on **R' Zeira** who says that there is a gezeira shava between the kometz and the shirayim. The gezeira shava teaches that just as one kometz is not mevatel another kometz, so too shirayim are not mevatel a kometz.
 - **Q:** The Mishna then said, if a kometz became mixed with a mincha that had not yet had its kometz taken, the mixture should not be offered on the Mizbe'ach. If it was offered, the owners of the mincha which had the kometz taken have fulfilled their obligation. The owners of the mincha that did not have the kometz taken have not fulfilled their obligation. Now, the Mishna seems to clearly say that the kometz does not become batel to the other mincha in the mixture. This can't follow the **Rabanan**, because they say that only things that are brought onto the Mizbe'ach don't become batel, but like kind things can become batel (and the mincha whose kometz was not yet taken is not brought up onto the Mizbe'ach, so it should be mevatel). It must follow **R' Yehuda**. Now according to **R' Chisda** this makes sense, because the majority (the mincha from which the kometz was not yet taken) can become like the minority (the kometz) because each part can be taken as the kometz, and therefore it is considered to be like kind, which is

why it does not become batel. However, according to **R' Chanina**, the minority cannot become like the majority, so they should be considered of unlike kind, and it should become batel!? **A:** Here too, we can answer based on **R' Zeira**.

- **Q:** The Mishna then said, if the kometz of a mincha became mixed with its shirayim, or with the shirayim of another mincha, the mixture should not be offered on the Mizbe'ach. If it was offered, the owner of the kometz has fulfilled his obligation. Now, in this case the majority (the shirayim) cannot become like the minority (the kometz) or visa-versa, so they should be considered as unlike kinds and should become batel, so why does the Mishna say that they don't!? This can't follow the view of the **Rabanan** (as explained above) and can't follow the view of **R' Yehuda** according to either shita of what he holds!? **A:** **R' Zeira** said, there is a gezeira shava between the kometz and the shirayim. The gezeira shava teaches that just as one kometz is not mevatel another kometz, so too shirayim are not mevatel a kometz.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, if spices are added to matzah the matzah is valid, but is called "spiced matzah". The Gemara assumes that this even refers to a case where enough spices were added to make the spices the majority of the mixture. Now, according to **R' Chanina** this makes sense, because the minority (the matzah) can become like the majority (the spices), because when the matzah spoils it will lose its status of matzah and will in that way be like the spices. Therefore, they are considered to be of like kind, which is why it does not become batel. However, according to **R' Chisda**, since the spices cannot become like the matzah it should be considered a mixture of unlike kinds, and therefore it should become batel!? **A:** The case of the Braisa is where the matzah is the majority, and that is why it does not become batel. The Braisa suggests that this is the case by saying that the mixture is called "spiced matzah" (referring to the mixture as a type of matzah, which suggests that the matzah is the majority). SHEMAH MINAH.