



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Menachos, Daf 71 – Daf 80

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf 71--55-----

- A Braisa says, we separate terumas maaser from fresh figs for dried figs based on number in a place where it is customary to allow figs to become dried figs. However, we do not separate from dried figs for fresh figs even in a place where it is customary to allow figs to become dried figs.
  - **Q:** The first part of the Braisa seems to say that if it is not customary to allow figs to dry then fresh figs may not be separated for dried figs. What case is the Braisa referring to? If there is a Kohen there to accept the terumas maaser it should be allowed even if it is not customary, because a Mishna says that when there is a Kohen there we separate terumah from superior produce! Rather, it is obvious that the case is that there is no Kohen there. However, the next part of the Braisa seems to imply that even if it is customary to allow the figs to dry we may not separate from dried figs for fresh figs. If the Braisa is discussing where there is no Kohen, why can't that be done? A Mishna says that when there is no Kohen there, we should separate from produce that can last longer rather than from superior produce! It must be that the case is that there is a Kohen there. Can we say that the first part refers to where there is no Kohen and the second part refers to where there is a Kohen!? **A:** Yes, the first part refers to where there is no Kohen and the second part refers to where there is a Kohen.
    - **R' Pappa** said, we see from here that it is better to say that a Braisa is referring to two different cases rather than to say that a Braisa is the view of two different Tanna'im.

#### MISHNA

- All menachos are kneaded with lukewarm water and must be guarded that they don't become chametz.
  - If the shirayim of the mincha becomes chametz, he is oiver on a lo saaseh.
- The requirement to guard the mincha from becoming chametz is based on the pasuk of "kol hamincha asher takrivu laHashem lo sei'aseh chametz".
  - One would be chayuv malkus for the kneading, the shaping, or the baking of a chametz mincha.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that he is oiver a lav for allowing the shirayim to become chametz? **A:** This is based on the pasuk that says "lo sei'afeh chametz chelkam", which **Reish Lakish** explains to mean that even the Kohen's piece may not be baked as chametz.
  - **Q:** A Braisa uses this pasuk for a different drasha, to teach that a person is chayuv malkus for each step in the process of the making of the chametz mincha (e.g. the kneading, the baking, etc.)!? **A: Reish Lakish** is darshening the word "chelkam".
    - **Q:** Maybe say that the pasuk is only for the drasha of **Reish Lakish** and not like the Braisa uses it? **A:** The fact that the pasuk says "lo sei'afeh chametz chelkam" instead of "chelkam lo sei'afeh chametz", we can learn both drashos.
    - **Q:** Why does the Braisa say that this pasuk teaches that each step in the process would bring a separate chiyuv malkus? Why not say that baking brings malkus, as stated in the pasuk, but with regard to the other steps one is only chayuv one set of malkus for all of the steps? **A:** Baking was part of the general issur of "lo sei'aseh chametz" and was taken out of the general issur with the pasuk of "lo sei'afeh". We have a rule that in such a case the thing taught when it is removed from the general pasuk is meant to apply to everything in the general rule.
      - **Q:** Why don't we instead say that "lo sei'aseh" is a klal and "lo sei'afeh" is a prat, and say it is a klal uprat, where the rule is that the klal only includes the item in the prat, and would therefore only include baking? **A: R' Aftoriki** said, the reason we don't say this is

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

that the klal and the prat are not near each other, and therefore they are not darshened in this way.

- **Q: R' Ada bar Ahava** asked, is it true that a klal and prat that are not near each other are not darshened in this way? A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the Nasi's chatas says that it should be shechted in the place that an olah is shechted. This teaches that the chatas should be shechted in the north. Now, we have a pasuk that teaches that every chatas should be shechted in the place that an olah is shechted, so why is the pasuk regarding a Nasi's chatas needed? It is needed to teach that if it is not shechted in the north it is passul. Maybe say instead that the pasuk is teaching that only this chatas needs to be shechted in the north, but other chatas need not be shechted in the north? That can't be, because the pasuk of chatas in general says it should be shechted in the place that an olah is shechted. Now, the Braisa seems to say that if not for the pasuk regarding all chatas we would say that the pasuk regarding the Nasi's chatas teaches that only that chatas needs to be shechted in the north but other chatas do not need to be shechted there. Presumably, this would be because we would darshen the general pasuk and the pasuk regarding the Nasi's chatas as a klal uprat even though the pesukim are far from each other!? **A: R' Ashi** said, the pasuk of the Nasi's chatas is written first, which makes it a case of prat uklal, which normally serves to include all. The fact that we don't darshen it like this shows that we don't darshen the pesukim that are far from each other.
  - The Gemara says, the reason the requirement to be shechted in the north would have been limited to the Nasi's chatas, if not for the additional pasuk, is because of the word "oso" in the pasuk of the Nasi's chatas, which would seem to teach that only this chatas must be shechted in the north.

### -----Daf ן]--56-----

- **Q:** The Gemara had explained that the reason the requirement to be shechted in the north would have been limited to the Nasi's chatas, if not for the additional pasuk, is because of the word "oso" in the pasuk of the Nasi's chatas, which would seem to teach that only this chatas must be shechted in the north. Now that we do have the additional pasuk, what does the word "oso" come to exclude? **A:** It is needed as darshened in a Braisa, which says that the pasuk teaches that only it – the Nasi's chatas discussed in the pasuk – needs to be shechted in the north, but the chatas of Nachshon (the chatas brought by the Nesi'im at the time that the Mishkan was put up) need not be shechted in the north. We would have thought that since **R' Yehuda** says this chatas needed semicha, it needed the north as well. That is why "oso" is needed to teach that it did not have to be shechted in the north.
  - **Q:** What about according to **R' Shimon** who says it did not need semicha? **Mar Zutra the son of R' Tavi** said to **Ravina**, even according to **R' Yehuda** you can't say that we would have thought that since it was included for semicha it should be included for the north, because we would not learn this one time korbon from other korbanos that are brought for generations. Therefore, "oso" is not needed to exclude the north requirement of the chatas of Nachshon!? **A:** Rather, "oso" teaches that the animal must be in the north when it is shechted, but the shochet need not be standing in the north.
    - **Q:** This halacha is learned in a Braisa from the "oso" of a different pasuk, so the "oso" written regarding the Nasi's chatas is not needed for this!? **A:** Rather, it teaches that the shechita of the animal needs to take place in the north, but the melika done to a bird korbon need not be done in the north. A Braisa says, we would think that if shechita, which can be done without a Kohen, needs to be done in the north, then melika, which must be done by a Kohen, must certainly be done in the north. That is why we need "oso" to teach that melika does not need to be done in the north.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Maybe the reason shechita of an animal must be done in the north is that the shechita must be done with a kli, but melika which is done with the Kohen's hand would never even be thought to need the north, so why do we need "oso"? **A:** Rather, "oso" teaches that the Nasi's chatas must be in the north, but the Korbon Pesach need not be shechted in the north. A Braisa says, we would think that if shechita of an olah, which has no set time, must be done in the north, then shechita of a Pesach, which has a set time, must surely be done in the north. That is why we need "oso" to teach that it need not be done in the north.
- **Q:** Maybe the reason an olah must be shechted in the north is because it is totally burned on the Mizbe'ach, but there would be no reason to think that a Pesach should need to be shechted in the north!? **A:** We could make this same kal v'chomer from a chatas, which is not totally burned.
- **Q:** Maybe a chatas needs the north because it brings a kapparah for aveiros that carry a chiyuv kares? **A:** We could make this same kal v'chomer from an asham, which does not bring a kapparah for a chiyuv kares.
- **Q:** Maybe an asham (and all these others) need the north because they are kodshei kodashim, but a Pesach, which is not, would not need the north? So why is "oso" needed? **A:** "Oso" comes to teach as we initially said – the animal must be shechted in the north, but the shochet need not be standing in the north. Although we asked that this is already learned in a Braisa from a different pasuk, we will say that the reason we learn it twice is to teach that although the shochet need not be in the north during the shechita, the Kohen who is doing the kabbalah does need to be in the north when he does the kabbalah.
  - **Q:** This is already known from "v'lakach", as stated above!? **A:** He does not darshen a "vuv" in this way, and therefore needs the "oso" to teach this.

### V'CHAYAV AHL LISHASA V' AHL ARICHASA V' AHL AFIYASA

- **R' Pappa** said, a person who baked a chametz mincha is chayuv two sets of malkus – one for shaping and one for baking.
  - **Q:** The Braisa quoted earlier said that one is chayuv a single set of malkus for baking!? **A:** That Braisa is discussing where the person did the shaping and the baking, and he is therefore chayuv one for the shaping and one for the baking. **R' Pappa** is discussing where one person did the shaping and then gave it to another person for the baking. In this case, since the baking is also the final step of the shaping, he will be chayuv one set of malkus for the shaping and one for the baking.
- A Braisa says, if an animal bechor had a life-threatening blood condition which could be healed by letting blood from it, **R' Meir** says we may only let blood in a way that would not make a mum in it (even though it is currently in a life-threatening situation and is therefore already a baal mum). The **Chachomim** say that we may let blood even if it will cause a mum, as long as we don't remove it from kedusha and allow the Kohen to eat it based on the mum that we have created. **R' Shimon** says we may even allow the bechor to be eaten by the Kohen based on this mum caused by the blood letting. **R' Yehuda** says, even if the bechor will die if left untreated, we may not let blood from it to heal it.
  - The basis of the machlokes is whether we can cause an assur result (make the bechor into a baal mum) when that result already exists (it is now going to die). **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, all these Tanna'im would agree that in the case of one who processes a chametz mincha after another person has already processed the chametz mincha, the person would be chayuv, because the pasuk says "lo sei'aseh chametz" and also says "lo sei'afeh chametz". All these Tanna'im would also agree that if one castrates an already castrated animal more severely than it was already castrated, he would be chayuv, because the pasuk says "uma'uch, v'kasus, v' nasuk, v'karus", which teaches that one is chayuv for the latter even if the previous was already done. **R' Meir and the Chachomim** only argue in

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the case of the Braisa, because **R' Meir** holds that the pasuk of “kol mum lo yihyeh bo” teaches that it is absolutely always assur to make a mum in the animal, even if there was already a mum there, whereas the **Rabanan** hold that the pasuk of “tamim yihyeh l'ratzon” teaches that it is only assur to make a mum if the animal was a “tamim”, but if it already had a mum anyway, the issur to make a mum would not apply.

- **Q:** How does **R' Meir** darshen the pasuk of “tamim yihyeh l'ratzon”? **A:** He uses it to teach that an animal that was *born* with a mum is not subject to the issur of making a mum in it.
  - **Q:** An animal born with a mum can never be made kodesh, so it is obvious that there would be no issur to make a mum in it!? **A:** Rather, he uses it to teach that the issur does not apply to a korbhan that became passul and was then redeemed from kodesh. We would think that since it remains assur to be shorn or worked it is also assur to make a mum in it. The pasuk therefore teaches that the issur does not apply.
- **Q:** How do the **Rabanan** darshen the pasuk of “kol mum lo yihyeh bo”? **A:** They use it to teach that one may not even indirectly cause a mum – for example, by putting dough on the animal's ear, causing a dog to come and bite it, thereby making a mum in the ear.

### -----Daf 7]---57-----

- **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

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

“osam”, which he said refers only to bikkurim and Shtei Halechem, so it is only for those two that one would be chayuv for putting them on the ramp.

-----Daf 71--58-----

- **Q:** The Gemara just explained that **R' Elazar** darshened the word “osam” to teach that one is chayuv for bringing the leftovers of bikkurim and the Shtei Halechem even onto the ramp of the Mizbe'ach. What does **R' Yochanan** (who says that one is chayuv for doing so to the leftovers of all korbanos) do with the word “osam”? **A:** He needs it for the teaching of a Braisa that says, we would think that a person can bring his own nedavah of a Shtei Halechem. The pasuk therefore says “korban reishis takrivu” (written in the plural), which teaches that only a tzibbur may bring a Shtei Halechem. We would think that a tzibbur can even bring the Shtei Halechem as a nedavah. The pasuk therefore says “osam”, which teaches that it can only be brought in its obligatory form at the proper time.
  - **Q:** Another Braisa seems to say that Shtei Halechem may be brought as a nedavah!? The Braisa says, the pasuk had to say “kol se'or” and “kol devash” (the pasuk has to say “kol” by each, and we could not learn one from the other), because there is a leniency that each has, which would prevent it from being learned from the other. The leniency of “se'or” is that there is an exception where it is mutar in the Mikdash, and the leniency of “devash” is that it is mutar with the shirayim of menachos. Now, where is “se'or” mutar in the Mikdash? Presumably it is the case of a Shtei Halechem offered as a nedavah!? **A: R' Amram** said, the Braisa means that it is mutar for the lambs that are offered along with the obligatory Shtei Halechem.
- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked **R' Chisda**, if someone brings the meat of a chatas bird onto the Mizbe'ach (the meat is supposed to be eaten, not burned on the Mizbe'ach), do we say that he would not be oiver, because one is only oiver for bringing up part of a korbon after the part of the korbon that was required to be brought up was already brought up, and the bird chatas has no part that is required to be brought up, or do we say that anything that is called a korbon and was brought up when it was not supposed to be brought up would make the person chayuv? **A: R' Chisda** said, anything that is called a korbon and was brought up when it was not supposed to be brought up would make the person chayuv.
  - We actually find that this is the subject of a machlokes Tanna'im in a Braisa, where **R' Eliezer** says that the issur is only against bringing up part of a korbon after the part of the korbon that was required to be brought up was already brought up, and **R' Akiva** says it is anything that is called a korbon and was brought up when it was not supposed to be brought up.
    - **Q:** What is the practical difference between these views? **R' Chisda** said, it is the case of the meat of a bird chatas that is brought up. **Rav** said, it is the case of the lug of oil of a metzora that is brought up.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk seems to say that one would only be chayuv for offering a full measure of chametz. How do we know that one is even chayuv for a partial measure? The pasuk says “kol”. How do we know that one is chayuv even if he offers a mixture of chametz and not chametz? The pasuk says “ki kol”.
  - **Abaye** explained, that when the Braisa says a “full measure” it refers to a kezayis, and a “partial measure” refers to less than a kezayis. **Rava** said, a “full measure” refers to a kometz, and a “partial measure” refers to less than a kometz.
    - The machlokes between them is that **Abaye** holds that a kometz can contain even less than 2 kezaysim and that burning on the Mizbe'ach can apply to less than a kezayis. **Rava** holds that a kometz cannot have less than 2 kezaysim and that burning requires at least a kezayis.
- We have learned, if someone burns a mixture of chametz and honey on the Mizbe'ach, **Rava** says he would get 4 sets of malkus: one for offering “se'or”, one for offering “devash”, one for offering a mixture of chametz, and one for offering a mixture of honey. **Abaye** says one does not get malkus for a generalized lav. Some say that **Abaye** holds he would get only one set of malkus, and others say that he holds that he wouldn't even get one set of malkus.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 59-----

## MISHNA

- There are some menachos that require oil and levonah, some that require oil and not levonah, some that require levonah and not oil, and some that require neither levonah nor oil.
  - The following menachos require oil and levonah: a minchas soles, a machavas, a marcheshes, challos, rekikin, minchas Kohanim, the mincha of the Kohen Gadol, the mincha of a goy, the mincha of a woman, and the Omer mincha.
  - A minchas nesachim requires oil but not levonah.
  - The Lechem Hapanim requires levonah but not oil.
  - The Shte Halechem, the chatas mincha, and the sotah's mincha require neither oil nor levonah.

## GEMARA

- **R' Pappa** said, wherever we have a list of menachos (like the first 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 11<sup>th</sup> case – where a person brings this mixed mincha. **R' Pappa** teaches that one may not bring a mixed mincha.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the Omer says “v'nasata aleha (“on it”) shemen”, which teaches that oil is not put on the Lechem Hapanim. We would think to make a kal v'chomer and say that if a minchas nesachim, which does not require levonah, still requires oil, then Lechem Hapanim, which does require levonah, should certainly require oil! The pasuk of “aleha” therefore teaches that it does not get oil. The pasuk then says “v'samta aleha levonah”, which teaches that the Omer gets levonah, but minchas nesachim does not. We would think to make a kal v'chomer and say that if Lechem Hapanim, which does not require oil does require levonah, then minchas nesachim, which does require oil, should certainly require levonah! The pasuk of “aleha” teaches that it does not get levonah. The pasuk then says “mincha hee”. The word “mincha” comes to include the mincha brought on the 8<sup>th</sup> day of the inauguration of the Mishkan, that it requires levonah. The word “hee” comes to exclude the Shte Halechem, to teach that it does not require oil or levonah.
  - **Q:** Instead of saying that “aleha” teaches that the Lechem Hapanim don't get oil, maybe instead say that it teaches that a minchas Kohanim should not get oil!? **A:** It makes more sense to say that the minchas Kohanim is included in the oil requirement, because it is similar to the Omer in that they both: require an issaron of flour, must use a kli shareis for kneading, are prepared outside the Heichal in the Azarah, become passul when left overnight, require hagasha, have at least some part that is put onto the fire of the Mizbe'ach.
    - **Q:** Maybe we should have instead included Lechem Hapanim, because it is similar to the Omer in that they both: come from the tzibbur, are obligatory, can override tumah, are eaten, are subject to piggul, are brought even on Shabbos!? **A:** The pasuk regarding mincha says “nefesh” – an individual, which teaches that all menachos of an individual require oil.
  - **Q:** Instead of saying that “aleha” teaches that the minchas nesachim doesn't get levonah, maybe instead say that it teaches that a minchas Kohanim should not get levonah!? **A:** It makes more sense to say that the minchas Kohanim is included in the levonah requirement, because it is similar to the Omer in that they both: require an issaron of flour, are mixed with one lug of oil, require hagasha, are brought on their own (rather than as an accompaniment to a korbun).
    - **Q:** Maybe we should have instead included minchas nesachim, because it is similar to the Omer in that they both: come from the tzibbur, are obligatory, can override tumah, and are brought even on Shabbos!? **A:** The pasuk regarding mincha says “nefesh” – an individual, which teaches that all menachos of an individual require levonah.
  - **Q:** Instead of saying that “mincha” comes to include the mincha of the 8<sup>th</sup> day, maybe say that it comes to *exclude* the mincha of the 8<sup>th</sup> day!? **A:** We would not think to learn a one-time korbun from future korbans, so there would be no reason to exclude it. Therefore, the pasuk must be understood to teach to include it.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Instead of saying that “hee” comes to exclude the Shte Halechem from the oil and levonah requirements, maybe instead say that it comes to exclude the minchas Kohanim!? **A:** It makes more sense to say that the minchas Kohanim is included in the requirements, because it is similar to the Omer in that they both: require an issaron of flour, must use a kli shareis for kneading, must be brought of matzah, are brought on their own, require hagasha, and have at least some part that is put onto the fire of the Mizbe’ach.
  - **Q:** Maybe we should have instead included the Shte Halechem, because it is similar to the Omer in that they both: come from the tzibbur, are obligatory, can override tumah, are eaten, are subject to piggul, are brought even on Shabbos, permit something, require tenufa, must be brought from produce of EY, have a set time to be offered, and must be brought from the new grains!? In fact, there are more ways in which the Shte Halechem is similar to the Omer over the ways in which the minchas Kohanim is similar to the Omer!? **A:** The pasuk regarding mincha says “nefesh” – an individual, which teaches that all menachos of an individual require oil and levonah.

### MISHNA

- If one puts oil and levonah into a chatas mincha or a sotah’s mincha he is chayuv separately for the oil and separately for the levonah.
  - If one puts oil into these menachos, they become passul. If one puts levonah, the levonah should be collected and taken out and the korbon becomes valid.
  - If one put oil on the shirayim, he is not oiver on a lav.
  - If he took a keili of oil and put the keili on top of a keili that had the flour of one of these menachos, it does not become passul.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the chatas mincha says “lo yasim aleha shemen”, which teaches that if oil was put on it, it becomes passul. We would think that when the pasuk then says “lo yitein aleha levonah” it also teaches that if levonah was put there it becomes passul. The pasuk therefore says “ki chatas”, which teaches that it would still be a valid korbon. We would think that putting the oil also doesn’t make it passul. The pasuk therefore says “hee”, which teaches that the adding of oil does make it passul. Why do we say that the addition of oil makes it passul, but the addition of levonah does not? The addition of oil makes it passul, because it is impossible to collect the oil from the flour. The addition of levonah does not, because the levonah can be collected from the flour.
- **Q: Rabbah bar R’ Huna** asked **R’ Yochanan**, what is the halacha if one put ground up levonah on the flour? Do we say that the only reason levonah doesn’t make it passul is because it can be collected from the flour, but this cannot be collected (because it is finely ground) and therefore it makes the korbon passul, or do we say that the reason levonah does not make it passul is because it does not become absorbed into the flour, and even the finely ground levonah does not become absorbed and therefore it is also valid? **A:** The Mishna said, if one added levonah it should be collected and the korbon remains valid. We see that it must be collected in order to be valid.
  - The Gemara says that this is not a valid proof. The Mishna may be giving two reasons: first, the levonah does not get absorbed into the flour, and second, it can even be removed from the flour.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from the Braisa that said that when levonah is added the korbon remains valid, because the levonah can be removed. We see that it must be collected in order to be valid! **A:** The Gemara says that this is not a valid proof. The Braisa may be giving two reasons: first, the levonah does not get absorbed into the flour, and second, it can even be removed from the flour.
  - **Q:** How do we come out regarding this question? **A: R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, a Braisa says, if levonah was put onto a chatas mincha or a sotah’s mincha, the levonah should be removed and it is valid. If before removing the levonah he has an improper thought of beyond its place or time, the korbon becomes passul, but there is no chiyuv kares. If after removing the levonah he has an improper

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

thought – if it was a beyond its place thought it is passul but there is no kares, and if it was a beyond its time thought it is piggul and there is also kares. We see clearly from the Braisa that the mincha is passul until the levonah is actually removed.

- **Q:** Why does an improper thought make it passul even when the levonah is still on it? It should be considered rejected and therefore not become passul from the thought!? **A:** **Abaye** said, the pasuk refers to the korbon as a “chatas” even with the levonah on it, which teaches that an improper thought could make it passul. **A2:** **Rava** said, the Braisa follows the view of **Chanan Hamitzri**, who does not hold of the concept of rejection. **A3:** **R’ Ashi** said, if it is within one’s power to fix the korbon, it does not become rejected (and it is within one’s power to remove the levonah, therefore it does not become rejected).
  - **R’ Ada** brings support for **R’ Ashi’s** answer.
- **R’ Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, if even the smallest amount of oil was put onto a kezayis size of a chatas mincha it becomes passul. This is based on the pasuk of “lo yasim”, which teaches that any amount of oil will make it passul, and “aleha”, which teaches that it must be placed on at least a kezayis of the mincha.
- **R’ Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, if even a kezayis of levonah was put onto even the smallest amount of a chatas mincha it becomes passul. This is based on the pasuk of “lo yitein”, which teaches that a kezayis of levonah will make it passul, and “aleha”, which is a “ribuy after a ribuy”, which comes to limit, which is why any amount of the mincha will suffice for this.
  - **Some** say that **R’ Yitzchak bar Yosef** said that **R’ Yochanan** asked, if the smallest amount of oil was put onto a kezayis of the mincha would it become passul? Do we say that the putting of the oil must be like the putting of the levonah and a kezayis is required, or not? **TEIKU**.

### NOSSAN SHEMEN AHL SHIREHA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “lo yasim aleha shemen v’lo yitein”. We would think that these are only two lavim when done by two separate Kohanim. The pasuk therefore says “aleha”, which teaches that the pasuk is referring to the mincha itself, not the Kohen. We would think that it is also assur to put a keili with oil or levonah onto a keili of the mincha, and if he does it will become passul. The pasuk therefore says “aleha”, which teaches that the pasuk is referring to the mincha itself, not the keilim.

## -----Daf 60-----

### 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 11<sup>th</sup> 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 ye’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

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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 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 korban. 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 Shte Halechem 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.

-----Daf 61-----

### MISHNA

- The following korbanos require tenufa but not hagasha: the lug of oil of the metzora and his ashram, bikkurim according to **R’ Eliezer ben Yaakov**, the eimurim of an individual’s shelamim and its chazeh and shok, both of men and of women, with male Yidden but not others, the Shte Halechem and the two Shavuot lambs. How is this done? The Kohen puts the Shte Halechem on top of the two lambs and he puts his two hands underneath them. He then brings them out, and then in, brings them up and then down. This is based on the pasuk of “asher hunaf va’asher huram”. Tenufa was done to the east of the Mizbe’ach and hagasha was done to the west. Tenufa is done before the hagasha.
  - The Omer mincha and the sotah’s mincha require hagasha and tenufa.
  - The Lechem Hapanim and the minchas nesachim do not require hagasha or tenufa.
- **R’ Shimon** says, there are 3 types of korbanos that between them require 3 mitzvos to be done, but each only requires 2 of these 3, but not the third. They are the individual’s shelamim, the tzibbur’s shelamim, and the metzora’s ashram. The individual’s shelamim requires semicha while it is living and tenufa after its shechita, but does not require tenufa while it is living. The tzibbur’s shelamim requires tenufa while alive and again after its

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

shechita, but does not require semicha. The metzora's asham requires semicha and tenufa while alive, but does not require tenufa after its shechita.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk of “v'heinif osam tenufa” teaches that the oil and the asham of the metzora require tenufa together. How do we know that if each had tenufa done separately he is yotzeh? The pasuk says “v'hikriv oso l'asham...v'heinif” (which implies that the oil may have its own tenufa). We may think that the pasuk is teaching that after a tenufa is done together there should be another tenufa done with them separately. The pasuk therefore says “tenufa”, in the singular, and not “tenufos”. The pasuk then says “lifnei Hashem”, which teaches that this may even be done on the east side of the Mizbe'ach.
  - **Q:** Regarding a mincha, when the pasuk says “lifnei Hashem” there is a thought to say that this refers only to the west side!? **A:** That is true regarding a mincha, which is referred to in the pasuk as a chatas, and since a chatas needs to be at the west so that it can be at a corner where there is a base to the Mizbe'ach it must be done on the west side. However, regarding a metzora the base is not needed. The only thing that is needed is that it be “lifnei Hashem”, and even the east side is considered to be “lifnei Hashem”.

### V'HABIKKURIM K'DIVREI R' ELIEZER BEN YAAKOV

- This view of **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** is seen in a Braisa, where he learns this from the words “v'lakach haKohen hateneh miyadecha” written regarding bikkurim. The Gemara explains, he learns this from the fact that the pasuk says “yadecha” and the pasuk by shelamim says “Yadav tivi'ena”. The gezeira shava teaches that bikkurim also requires tenufa. This teaches that just as by bikkurim the Kohen must do the tenufah, the same is by a shelamim. And, just as by a shelamim it must be done by the owner, the same is by bikkurim. The way this is done is that the Kohen puts his hand under the hand of the owner and together they do tenufah.
- **Q:** Why didn't the Mishna say that this also follows the view of **R' Yehuda** who also says that bikkurim requires tenufa, and learns it from other words in the pesukim? **A:** **Rava** said, the Mishna chose to mention **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov**, because the words that he darshens come first in the Mishna. **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the Mishna chose him, because his views are always followed.

### V'EIMUREI SHALMEI YACHID...

- **Q:** The Mishna first says that the korbanos of men and women require waving and then says it applies to Yidden “but not others”, which seems to exclude women!? **A:** **R' Yehuda** said, the Mishna means that the korbon of men and of women require tenufa, but only men actually do the tenufa, so in the case of a woman's korbon the Kohen alone would do the tenufa.
- A Braisa says, we would think that the pasuk regarding tenufa begins by using the words “Bnei Yisrael”, which should teach that only the korban of a male Yid requires tenufa, but not the korbon of a goy or of a woman, which would be similar to the semicha requirement. However, the Braisa then says that all the korbanos require tenufa, and the pasuk should be understood as teaching that only a male Yid can actually do the tenufa. For the korbon of a goy or of a woman, only the Kohen does the tenufa.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding tenufa says “Bnei Yisrael”. How do we know to include the korbanos of geirim and freed slaves? The pasuk says “hamakriv”, which includes them as well. Maybe we should say that “hamakriv” refers to the Kohen, and it teaches that the owner doesn't do the tenufa, only the Kohen does? The pasuk says “Yadav tivi'ena”, which teaches that the owner does do the tenufa. Therefore, “hamakriv” must be teaching regarding the geirim and freed slaves. How is this done? The Kohen puts his hand under the hand of the owner and together they do tenufah. How is the tenufa done? He puts the eimurim on the palm of his hand and then puts the chazeh and shok on top of them. If there are breads as part of this korbon, the breads go on top of that.
  - **R' Pappa** said, we learn from the Milu'im that the breads are always put on the top.
  - **Q:** Why are the chazeh and shok put on top of the eimurim? It can't be based on the pasuk that says “shok haterumah vachazei hatenufa ahl ishei hachalavim” (which says that they go on top of the fats), because there is another pasuk that says “es hacheilev ahl hechazeh” (which says that the fats go on top)!? **A:** **Abaye** said, the second pasuk refers to the Kohen who is bringing these items from the place in

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

which they were butchered. He then turns it over into the hands of the one who will do the tenufa, and when he does so it results in the chazeh and shok being on top.

- **Q:** Another pasuk asys “vayasimu es hachalavim ahl hechazos”, which shows that they were offered with the fats on top!? **A:** That is true, because after the tenufa it is given over to another Kohen who offers it, and it is given over to him by turning it upside down, so that the fats are back on top. This teaches that we should use 3 Kohanim for this process, to fulfill the pasuk of “b’rav ahm hadras Melech”.