



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

Menachos Daf Ayin Daled

R' SHIMON OMER MINCHAS CHOTEI SHEL KOHANIM...

- **Q:** What is the reasoning of **R' Shimon**? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk of "v'huysa laKohen kamincha" teaches that if a Kohen must bring a chatas mincha, he may do the Avodah for himself. The Braisa asks, maybe the pasuk teaches that the chatas of a mincha may be eaten by the Kohen, and the other pasuk that says that the mincha of a Kohen is not eaten refers only to the minchas nedavah of a Kohen? The pasuk of "v'huysa laKohen kamincha" creates a hekesh of his obligatory mincha to his minchas nedavah, which teaches that just as his nedavah is not eaten, his obligatory mincha is not eaten either. **R' Shimon** said, the pasuk doesn't say that it should be to the Kohen "kaminchaso" ("his mincha"), rather it says "kamincha", which creates a hekesh between the chatas mincha of a Kohen and the chatas mincha of a Yisrael, and teaches that the chatas mincha of a Kohen also requires a kemitza. However, the pasuk says "laKohen kamincha", which teaches that the Kohen's chatas mincha is only like a Yisrael's mincha with respect to the Avodah that must be done by a Kohen – i.e. the kemitza, but is not the same with regard to it being eaten by a Kohen. Rather, the chatas mincha of a Kohen must have a kemitza removed and offered, and then the shirayim are also offered onto the Mizbe'ach afterwards as well.
 - **Q:** The fact that a Kohen may do the Avodah of his own korbon is learned in another Braisa from the pasuk of "uvah b'chol avas nafsho...v'sheireis"!? **A:** From that pasuk we would not know that this is even true for a korbon which brings him a kapparah (e.g. his chatas).
 - **Q:** Another Braisa learns from the pasuk of "v'chiper haKohen ahl hanefesh hashogeges b'chetah bishgaga" that a Kohen may even do the Avodah for his own chatas!? **A:** From that pasuk we would only know that he can do the Avodah for a korbon that brings a kapparah for an aveirah that he did b'shogeg. We would not know that this is even true for something he did b'mezid, like where he swore falsely denying the knowledge of testimony.
- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon** says, the chatas mincha of a Kohen must have a kemitza removed. The kometz is then burned on the Mizbe'ach and the shirayim are then burned separately on the Mizbe'ach. **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** says, the kometz is offered on the Mizbe'ach and the shirayim are spread over the Beis Hadeshen.
 - **R' Chiya bar Abba** said that **R' Yochanan** asked which "Beis Hadeshen" this refers to – if it refers to the one on the Mizbe'ach, then **R' Elazar** is saying the same thing as his father, and if it refers to the one off the Mizbe'ach, how can he say it is placed there and that is considered to be "offered"? We don't find anything that is "offered" off the Mizbe'ach!? **R' Abba** said, maybe **R' Elazar** means that the shirayim of a Kohen's mincha is destroyed. Other talmidim laughed at that and said, if it is destroyed it cannot be considered to have been offered!?
 - **R' Avin's** father taught a Braisa that darshens the pasuk "v'chol minchas Kohen kalil tihyeh lo sei'acheil" to teach that the chatas mincha of a Kohen is compared to the minchas chavitin only in regard to eating (it teaches that the chatas is not eaten) but not in regard to the Avodah (the chavitin is offered on the Mizbe'ach, whereas the shirayim of the chatas would be sent to the Beis Hadeshen). **Abaye** explained the drasha that "kol minchas Kohen...lo sei'acheil" refers to the Kohen's chatas mincha, and "kalil tihyeh" refers to his minchas nedavah. The requirement that it be entirely burned on the Mizbe'ach therefore does not apply to his chatas mincha. **Rava** said, we can't cut up a pasuk in this way. Rather, he learns the same thing as **Abaye**, but instead darshens the pasuk

as follows: “kol minchas Kohen kalil tihyeh” refers to his minchas nedavah, and “lo sei’acheil” refers to his chatas.

- **Q:** Maybe the drasha should be reversed and should instead teach that the shirayim of his nedavah should be thrown onto the Beis Hadeshen whereas his chatas should be offered entirely on the Mizbe’ach? **A:** It makes more sense to say that his nedavah should be offered like the chavitin, because it is tadir, it is not brought for an aveirah, and it has a pleasant smell (it has oil and levonah) like a chavitin.
 - **Q:** Maybe it makes more sense to treat the chatas like the chavitin, because they are both brought from an issaron of flour and are both obligatory? **A:** The chavitin is similar in more ways to the nedavah than it is to the chatas.
- **Q:** The **Rabanan**, who hold that the Kohen’s chatas mincha does not get a kemitza, what do they learn from the pasuk of “v’chol minchas Kohen kalil tihyeh lo sei’acheil”? **A:** They use it for the drasha of a Braisa, which uses this pasuk for a gezeira shava to teach that all menachos of a Kohen are offered entirely on the Mizbe’ach and all are subject to a lav against eating the mincha.
- **Q:** **Ravina** asked, what is the halacha if a Kohen ate the eimurim of a korbon? It is clear that he is oiver the lav of “kol zar lo yochal kodesh”, because he is considered to be a “zar” with regard to eimurim. The question is whether he is oiver on the lav of “kalil tihyeh” as well. Does this only apply to menachos or does it apply to all parts that are supposed to be offered on the Mizbe’ach? **A:** **R’ Aharon** said to **Ravina**, a Braisa says that **R’ Eliezer** said, the pasuk of “kalil tihyeh” serves to place a lav for the eating of anything that is supposed to be burned on the Mizbe’ach. Therefore, there would be a lav for eating the eimurim as well.

MISHNA

- The mincha of a Kohen, the mincha of the Kohen Gadol, and the minchas nesachim are offered on the Mizbe’ach in their entirety and are not given to the Kohanim. With regard to these korbanos, the rights of the Mizbe’ach are stronger than the rights of the Kohanim.
- The Shte Halechem and the Lechem Hapanim are eaten entirely by the Kohanim and are not offered at all on the Mizbe’ach. With regard to these korbanos, the rights of the Kohanim are stronger than the rights of the Mizbe’ach.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The first part of the Mishna implies that only those korbanos are offered in their entirety on the Mizbe’ach. This is not accurate, since we know that an olah is offered in its entirety as well!? **A:** The olah has the skins that are given to the Kohanim.
 - **Q:** The bird olah is offered in its entirety!? **A:** The crop and feathers of the bird olah are not offered on the Mizbe’ach.
 - **Q:** The wine of nesachim are offered entirely on the Mizbe’ach!? **A:** They are poured into the “shisin”, and are not burned on the Mizbe’ach.
 - The Mishna is teaching to exclude the ruling of **Shmuel**, who says that nesachim are sprinkled onto the fire of the Mizbe’ach. The Mishna teaches that it is only these korbanos that are offered in their entirety, and the nesachim are poured into the shisin. The Mishna also supports another ruling of **Shmuel** where he said that when one brings a korbon of oil, a kemitza is taken and the shirayim are eaten (and we would not burn it entirely on the Mizbe’ach).

SHTEI HALECHEM V’LECHEM HAPANIM

- **Q:** Are there no other korbanos that are eaten entirely by the Kohanim? There is the case of the chatas bird!? **A:** The blood of the bird is offered on the Mizbe’ach.
 - **Q:** There is the case of the lug of oil of a metzora!? **A:** Part of the oil is thrown to the paroches and part is put onto the metzora. The Kohen then gets the remaining oil.
 - The Mishna is teaching to exclude the view that holds that if the Shte Halechem are brought without the accompanying korbanos, they are burned on the Mizbe’ach. The Mishna teaches that even if they are brought on their own they are eaten by the Kohanim.

MISHNA

- All menachos that are made in a kli shareis require 3 placings of oil – pouring (which is done after the mixing), mixing (added to the flour to mix it), and putting oil into the kli before the mincha is made.
 - **Rebbi** says, oil is mixed into the mincha after they have been made into challos. The **Chachomim** say it is done while it is still flour.
 - With regard to baked menachos, if they are made as challos it is required to be mixed with oil. If they are made as rekikin, the oil is smeared onto them. How is it smeared? In the shape of a “chi”.
 - The remaining oil is eaten by the Kohanim.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What type of mincha does the Mishna mean to exclude by referring only to menachos made in a kli shareis? **A: R' Pappa** said it comes to exclude a baked mincha.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk of “soles bashemen tei'aseh” written regarding a marcheshes teaches that there must be oil put into the keili before the flour is put in. The word “korbanecha” creates a gezeira shava between marcheshes and machavas, which teaches that a machavas also requires that oil be put into the keili before the flour is put in. The gezeira shava also teaches that just as a machavas requires pouring of oil after the mixing and oil for the mixing, a marcheshes requires oil at those points as well.