



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

Menachos Daf Samach

MISHNA

- There are some korbanos that require hagasha but not tenufa, some that require tenufa but not hagasha, some that require hagasha and tenufa, and some that require neither tenufa nor hagasha.
 - The following require hagasha but not tenufa: a minchas soles, a machavas, a marcheshes, challos mincha, rekikin, minchas Kohanim, the mincha of the Kohen Gadol, the mincha of a goy, the mincha of women, and the chatas mincha. **R' Shimon** says that the minchas Kohanim and the mincha of the Kohen Gadol do not require hagasha, because they do not require kemitza, and anything that does not require kemitza does not require hagasha.

GEMARA

- **R' Pappa** said, wherever we have a list of menachos (like the list in our Mishna), it is always a list of ten. This comes to exclude the view of **R' Shimon**, who says that when a person promises to bring a baked mincha he may bring half of the required mincha as challos and half as rekikin. According to this view the Mishna should list an 11th case – where a person brings this mixed mincha. **R' Pappa** teaches that one may not bring a mixed mincha.
- A Braisa explains the sources for the requirements of hagasha for the various menachos:
 - The Braisa says, if the pasuk would have said “v'heiveisa asher yei'aseh mei'eileh laHashem v'hikriva ehl haKohen v'higisha”, without saying the word “mincha”, we would say that the hagasha is only done to the kometz. The word “mincha” teaches that it is done to the entire mincha. How do we know that this applies to the chatas mincha as well? The words “es hamincha” teach to include it. It would seem that the hagasha obligation of the chatas mincha can be derived via logic – the pasuk regarding the chatas mincha uses verbiage of “bringing” and the pasuk regarding the minchas nedava does so as well, and we could therefore darshen that just as the minchas nedavah requires hagasha the chatas mincha requires it as well! However, we could ask that a minchas nedava is different, because it also requires oil and levonah. We would say that the sotah's mincha shows that oil and levonah are not what brings about the hagasha requirement, because it does not require oil or levonah and yet it requires hagasha! We would say that the sotah's mincha is different in that it requires tenufah. We would then say that a minchas nedavah does not require tenufah and yet it requires hagasha! We can go back and forth, with the result that there is a tzad hashava that they both require kemitza and hagasha. Based on this we can include the chatas mincha in the tzad hashava since it also requires kemitza, and should therefore also require hagasha. The Braisa asks, we can say that minchas nedavah and a sotah's mincha are different in that they may be brought by a wealthy person or a poor person, whereas a chatas mincha may only be brought by a poor person!? Because of this refutation, we need the words “es hamincha” to teach that the chatas mincha requires hagasha.
 - The Braisa continues, **R' Shimon** says, the word “v'heiveisa” comes to teach that the Omer is also required in hagasha, since we see the term “vahaveisem” is used regarding the Omer. The word “v'hikriva” teaches that the sotah's mincha requires hagasha, as the pasuk says “v'hikriv osah” regarding the sotah's mincha. It would seem that this could be learned via logic – if the chatas mincha, which does not require tenufa, still requires hagasha, then the sotah's mincha, which requires tenufa should certainly require hagasha! We can refute that by saying that the chatas is different in that it is brought from wheat, whereas the sotah's mincha is brought from barley. We can ask that the

omer is brought from barley and yet it requires hagasha!? We would say that the Omer is different because it requires oil and levonah. We would then ask that the chatas doesn't require oil or levonah and yet it requires hagasha! We go back and forth, with the result that there is a tzad hashava that they both require kemitza and hagasha. Based on this we can include the sotah's mincha in the tzad hashava since it also requires kemitza, and should therefore also require hagasha. The Braisa asks, we can say that the chatas mincha and the Omer are different in that they must be brought from very refined "soles" flour, and not less refined "kemach" flour, whereas the sotah's mincha may be brought from kemach. Because of this refutation, we need the word "v'hikriva" to teach that the sotah's mincha requires hagasha.

- The Braisa continues, **R' Yehuda** says, the word "v'heiveisa" teaches that a sotah's mincha requires hagasha, as the pasuk regarding the sotah's mincha uses the similar word of "v'heivi".
 - The Gemara says, the Omer does not need a pasuk to teach that it requires hagasha, because it can be learned from a kal v'chomer – if a chatas mincha, which does not require tenufa, requires hagasha, then the Omer, which requires tenufa, certainly requires hagasha.
 - We can ask that the chatas is different because it is brought from wheat!? The Gemara says, the sotah's mincha is not brought from wheat and still it requires hagasha. The Gemara asks, the sotah's mincha is different because it is brought to clarify an aveira!? The Gemara says that the chatas is not brought to clarify an aveira and still it requires hagasha. We go back and forth, with the result that there is a tzad hashava that they both require kemitza and hagasha. Based on this we can include the Omer in the tzad hashava since it also requires kemitza, and should therefore also require hagasha.
 - **Q:** What question can we ask on this that would explain why a pasuk is needed? **A: R' Shimon** would ask that chatas and sotah are different since they may be brought many times throughout the year, whereas an Omer is only brought once a year. **R' Yehuda** holds this is not a valid refutation, because it may be that the Omer is brought more often than the chatas and the sotah's mincha, since it is definitely brought at least once a year. This is why **R' Yehuda** holds that a pasuk is not needed for Omer.
- The Braisa continues and asks, maybe the word "v'heiveisa" teaches that a person may donate a mincha of barley as well? This would be supported by logic – the tzibbur brings an obligatory mincha of wheat and also brings an obligatory mincha of barley, similarly, individuals who bring a donated mincha of wheat should be allowed to bring a donated mincha of barley! The pasuk therefore says "eileh" to teach that an individual may only donate a mincha of wheat, and therefore the word "v'heiveisa" is to be used for another drasha. Maybe we should say that "eileh" teaches that if someone promises to bring a mincha he must bring all of the 5 different types of menachos? The pasuk says "**mei**'eileh", which teaches that even just one type may be brought. Therefore, "eileh" must be teaching that an individual may not donate a mincha of barley.
- The Braisa continues, **R' Shimon** says, "es hamincha" comes to include other menachos, like the mincha of a goy or of a woman, in the hagasha requirement. We would think to say that this even includes the Shte'i Halechem and the Lechem Hapanim in the hagasha requirement as well. The pasuk therefore says "**mei**'eileh", to exclude these. Why is it that we see fit to include other menachos but to exclude these? I include the others because there is at least part of them that is burned on the Mizbe'ach, and I exclude these, which have no part that goes onto the Mizbe'ach. The minchas nesachim is totally burned on the Mizbe'ach, so it should require hagasha!? The pasuk therefore says "v'hikriva", to exclude minchas nesachim from hagasha.
 - **Q:** The Gemara asks, "v'hikriva" was already used to teach that the sotah's mincha requires hagasha!? **A:** The pasuk could have said "v'hikriv" and instead says "v'hikriva", which allows us to learn two things from it.

- The Braisa asks, why do we see fit to include other menachos in hagasha, but to exclude minchas nesachim? We include the other menachos since they are brought on their own account, rather than as an accompaniment for another korbon. Based on this we should say that the minchas Kohanim and the mincha of a Kohen Gadol require hagasha since they are brought on their own account? The pasuk of “v’higisha” comes to exclude these menachos from hagasha.
 - **Q:** The Gemara asks, the word “v’higisha” is needed to teach the basic law of hagasha!? **A:** The pasuk could have said “v’higish” and instead says “v’higisha”, which allows for both drashos.
- The Braisa asks, why do we see fit to include other menachos and to exclude the minchas Kohanim and the mincha of a Kohen Gadol? We include the other menachos because they have a part that is brought on the Mizbe’ach, they come on their own account, and they have a part that goes to the Kohanim, and we exclude the Shteihalechem and the Lechem Hapanim since they have no part that goes on the Mizbe’ach, we exclude the minchas nesachim since it is not brought on its own account, and we exclude the minchas Kohanim and the mincha of a Kohen Gadol since they have no part that goes to the Kohen.
- The Braisa continues, the pasuk regarding the kemitza says “v’heirim”. We would think that it should be done with a keili. There is another pasuk that says “v’heirim mimenu b’kumtzo”. Just as there it is done by hand (as taught by the word “b’kumtzo”), here too the “v’heirim” must be done by hand.