



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

Menachos Daf Nun Zayin

- **R' Ami** said, if one puts yeast on the mincha dough and leaves it there, and the dough then became chametz on its own, he is chayuv, just as he would be for the similar case regarding Shabbos (if he takes a raw piece of meat and puts it on coals and it then cooks on its own).
 - **Q:** Would a person be chayuv in this case of Shabbos? **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, that if someone puts a piece of meat onto coals on Shabbos, if he then turned it over he would be chayuv, but if he did not he would be patur!? **A:** **Rava** said, when **R' Ami** said he would be chayuv for putting the yeast onto the mincha dough, he was also referring to where he put yeast on both sides of the dough, which would make it more fully chametz.
 - **Q:** What is the case of **R' Yochanan**? If the case is that had he not turned it over it would not cook, then it is obvious that he is patur!? If the case is that if he did not turn it over it still would have cooked, then he should be chayuv!? **A:** The case is that if he did not turn it over, only one side would have cooked the amount of Ben Drusai (the minimum amount of cooking that is considered to be cooking for Shabbos), and if he turned it over both sides would have cooked this minimum amount. **R' Yochanan** is teaching that cooking only one side in this amount is not considered cooking for purposes of Shabbos.
 - **Rava** said, if a dried fig's size piece of meat was roasted in one place, the person is chayuv.
 - **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, if he roasted this amount, but the amount was divided over 2 or 3 places, he would not be chayuv? A Mishna says that one is chayuv for drilling even the tiniest hole. Now a tiny hole is not useful for anything, so it must mean that he is chayuv if he drills 2 or 3 tiny holes that can then combine into a larger hole. Similarly, we should say that he should be chayuv for roasting in 2 or 3 places if they combine to reach the minimum size!? **A:** The Mishna is talking about where he drilled one tiny hole. The reason he is chayuv is because it is fit to use as a hole for the tooth of a key.
 - **Others** say that **Rava** said he is chayuv even if he roasted 2 or 3 places that combine to this size. **Ravina** then attempted to bring the Mishna regarding drilling as a proof for **Rava**, but **R' Ashi** said the case of drilling is different, because it can be used for the tooth of a key.
- A Braisa says, had the pasuk only said "asher takrivu laHashem lo sei'aseh chametz", I would say that only the kometz is subject to the lav of making it chametz. The pasuk therefore says "mincha", which teaches that this lav applies to the entire mincha. How do we know that other menachos (besides the minchas marcheshes, which is the subject of the pasuk) are also included in the lav? The pasuk says "kol hamincha". The pasuk of "asher takrivu laHashem" teaches that one is only chayuv if he makes a valid mincha into chametz, but would be patur if he did so to a passul mincha.
 - **Q: R' Pappa** asked, if a person made a mincha into chametz and it was then taken out of the Azarah and it was then baked, which completed the chametz process, would he be chayuv? Do we say that since it became passul by leaving the Azarah it became passul and is therefore not subject to becoming chametz after having become chametz, or do we say that since it became chametz the psul of leaving the Azarah doesn't really affect it and therefore, making it further chametz does make him chayuv? The Gemara remains with a **TEIKU**.

- **Q: R' Mari** asked, if one made the mincha chametz on top of the Mizbe'ach, is he chayuv? The pasuk says "asher takrivu", and this mincha was already offered by having it brought up onto the Mizbe'ach and therefore maybe he is patur. Or, maybe we say that since it was not yet burned it is still subject to the lav? The Gemara remains with a **TEIKU**.
- **Q:** Since we end up learning from "kol hamincha" that the lav applies to the entire mincha, why do we need the "asher takrivu" (which refers to the kometz)? **A:** It is needed as taught in a Braisa, where **R' Yose Haglili** says it includes a minchas nesachim in the lav against making it chametz, and **R' Akiva** says it includes the Lechem Hapanim in the lav.
 - **Q:** Minchas nesachim is mixed with a lot of oil in the kneading process, and fruit juices (including olive oil) do not cause things to become chametz!? **A: Reish Lakish** said that **R' Yose Haglili** would say that a minchas nesachim that was kneaded with water (along with the oil) is valid. Therefore, it is possible for it to become chametz.
 - **Q:** Lechem Hapanim are measured in keilim used for solid volume measuring, and **R' Akiva** says that such keilim do not make things kadosh. Therefore, the Lechem Hapanim would not become kadosh until they are placed onto the Shulchan, which means they are not subject to the lav of chametz before then!? **A: Ravin in the name of R' Yochanan** said, we must reverse the shitos of the Braisa, so that it is **R' Akiva** who says that minchas nesachim is included in the lav against making it chametz, and **R' Yose** who says it is the Lechem Hapanim that is included in the lav.
 - According to this answer of **R' Yochanan**, he follows his view elsewhere where he said that **R' Yose Haglili** holds that keilim used for solid measuring *do* make things kadosh.
 - **Q: R' Pappa** asked **Abaye**, the kneading bowl that was used for menachos was used for liquids. Presumably, this was also used for the kneading of the Lechem Hapanim, and maybe that is why it becomes kadosh then, at a time when it can still become chametz, so why did we have to reverse the shitos!? **A: Abaye** said, we still had to reverse the shitos for a case where the dough was kneaded on a piece of leather, and not in a kli shareis.
- A Braisa says, how do we know that if one brings meat of a chatas, or meat of an asham, or meat of kodshei kodashim, or meat of kodshei kalim, or the shirayim of the Omer, or the shirayim of the Shte Halechem, or of the shirayim of the Lechem Hapanim, or of the shirayim of regular menachos, onto the Mizbe'ach, that he is oiver a lav? The pasuk says "ki chol se'or v'chol devash lo saktiru mimenu isheh laHashem", which teaches that any korbon from which the parts that are supposed to go onto the Mizbe'ach went onto the Mizbe'ach, is subject to the lav (for the remaining parts of the korbon) of "lo saktiru" (you shall not burn it on the Mizbe'ach).
 - **Q:** The Shte Halechem and the Lechem Hapanim have no part of them that go onto the Mizbe'ach!? A Braisa regarding hagasha says that they are excluded from hagasha because they have nothing that goes onto the Mizbe'ach!? **A: R' Sheishes** said, there is nothing of them themselves that goes on the Mizbe'ach, but the Shte Halechem is considered to be the leftover after the lambs are brought and the Lechem Hapanim are considered to be the leftover after the levonah is brought onto the Mizbe'ach, for purposes of the lav.
 - We learned, if a person brings any of the items listed in the Braisa onto the ramp (not the Mizbe'ach itself), **R' Yochanan** says he is chayuv as if he put it onto the Mizbe'ach and **R' Elazar** says he is patur. **R' Yochanan's** view is based on a Braisa that says that the words "v'ehl haMizbe'ach lo yaalu" teach to include the ramp in the lav as well. **R' Elazar** says that the pasuk of "v'ehl haMizbe'ach" says it refers to "osam", which he said refers only to bikkurim and Shte Halechem, so it is only for those two that one would be chayuv for putting them on the ramp.