



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o'h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o'h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Minchah Mixed Outside

It was stated: If the *minchah* offering was mixed (*with the oil*) outside the walls of the Courtyard, Rabbi Yochanan said: It is invalid. Rish Lakish said: It is valid.

The *Gemara* explains their reasoning: Rish Lakish said that it is valid, for it is written: *And he shall pour oil upon it, and place levonah upon it*, and then it says: *And he shall bring it to the sons of Aaron, the Kohanim, and he shall take the komeitz*. Evidently, it is from the *kemitzah* and on which begins the duty of *Kehunah*. This therefore teaches us that the pouring of the oil upon the *minchah* and the mixing of the oil with the flour are valid even if they are done by non-*Kohanim*. And since the mixing does not require the *Kehunah*, it likewise does not need to be performed inside the Courtyard. Rabbi Yochanan says that it is invalid, for since it must be prepared in a sacred service vessel, although it does not the *Kehunah*, it must nevertheless be performed inside the Courtyard.

The *Gemara* cites a *Baraisa* in support of Rabbi Yochanan: If a non-*Kohen* mixed it, it is valid; if it was mixed outside the Courtyard, it is invalid. (9a1 – 9a2)

Deficient Minchah

It was stated: If the *minchah* offering was reduced before the *komeitz* was taken from it, Rabbi Yochanan said: He may bring flour from his house to replenish it. Rish Lakish said: He may not bring flour from his house to replenish it.

The *Gemara* explains their reasoning: Rabbi Yochanan said that may bring flour from his house to replenish it, for it is the *kemitzah* that determines it for a *minchah* offering (*and therefore, it is not ruled to be invalid because of its deficiency, before the kemitzah*). Rish Lakish said that he may not bring flour from his house to replenish it, for it is the sanctity of the vessel that determines it for a *minchah* offering.

Rabbi Yochanan asked Rish Lakish from a *Mishnah*: If the *log* of oil (*used for the metzora's purification*) became deficient before it was poured out (*onto the palm of the second Kohen*), he may replenish it (*although it had already been placed in a service vessel*). This is indeed a refutation. (9a2)

It was stated: Regarding remnants that were reduced between the *kemitzah* and the burning, Rabbi Yochanan said: One may still burn the *komeitz* for them. Rish Lakish said: One may not burn the *komeitz* for them.

The *Gemara* notes: According to Rabbi Eliezer, they do not argue (*and they both maintain that it may be burned*); they argue, however, according to Rabbi Yehoshua, for it was taught in a *Mishnah*: If the remainder of the *minchah* offering became *tamei*, or was burned or lost, according to the law laid down by Rabbi Eliezer (*that the blood may be applied to the altar even if the meat of the sacrifice has been lost*), it is valid (*and one may still burn the komeitz for them*), but according to Rabbi Yehoshua (*who maintains that the blood may not be applied to the altar if the meat of the sacrifice has been lost*), It is invalid. Now, the one who holds that it is invalid, clearly agrees with Rabbi Yehoshua; but he maintains that it is valid can say as follows: Only in that case

did Rabbi Yehoshua say that it is invalid, since there is no meat remaining at all, but here where some *minchah* remains, even Rabbi Yehoshua admits that it is valid.

For it has been taught in a *Baraisa*: Rabbi Yehoshua said: All the sacrifices of the Torah (which was lost or destroyed) of which as an olive's volume of meat or an olive's volume of *cheilev* (sacrificial parts) remains, he sprinkles the blood. If there remains half an olive's volume of meat and half an olive's volume of *cheilev*, he may not sprinkle the blood. But in the case of an *olah*, even if there remains half an olive's volume of meat and half an olive's volume of *cheilev*, he sprinkles the blood, because it is completely burned. By a *minchah* offering, however, even if it is completely in existence, he must not sprinkle the blood.

Rav Pappa explains that the *minchah* case refers to the libation *minchah* which accompanies an animal sacrifice. I might have thought that since the *minchah* comes together with the sacrifice, it is regarded as part of it (and the blood may be sprinkled if the *minchah* remains); the *Baraisa* informs us that this is not the case.

Rish Lakish, who invalidates the *minchah* (if the remnants have been reduced), would say that a *minchah* is different, because it is written: The *Kohen* shall separate from the *minchah* its remembrance and burn it on the altar. Since it says "the *minchah*," we derive that it may not be burned unless the entire *minchah* remains.

Rabbi Yochanan would understand "the *minchah*" to be referring to the *minchah* that was there (at the time of the *kemitzah*).

Rabbi Yochanan asked Rish Lakish from the following *Baraisa*: If before the *lechem hapanim* (showbread) was taken off the *shulchan* (table) it broke into pieces, the bread is considered invalid, and the spoons of *levonah* (frankincense) cannot be burned. If it broke into pieces after it was taken off the *shulchan*, the bread is considered invalid

but the spoons of *levonah* can be burned. Rabbi Elozar says: This does not mean that it was actually taken off, but rather that it was time for it to be taken off the *shulchan*, and it therefore is as if it was taken off. [We see that the *minchah* is valid even in a case where it becomes deficient after the *kemitzah* (or removal of the spoons)!?]

Rish Lakish answers: The *Baraisa* is according to the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer.

Rabbi Yochanan asked him: if it is in accordance with Rabbi Eliezer, why did the *Baraisa* say that the breads broke into pieces; even if it was burned or lost, the *levonah* will still be valid!?

Rish Lakish was silent.

The *Gemara* asks: Why did he remain silent? Could he not have answered that a public offering (such as the *lechem hapanim*) is different, for since permission is granted with respect to *tumah*, permission is granted with respect to deficient offerings as well.

Rav Adda bar Ahavah answers: This (that he did not answer in such a manner) indicates that a deficient offering is like a blemished one, and there is no permission granted for a blemished animal as a public offering.

Rav Pappa was sitting and he said over this discussion. Rav Yosef the son of Shemaya said to him: Were Rabbi Yochanan and Rish Lakish not discussing a *minchas omer* as well, and that is a public offering (so evidently, Rish Lakish would not agree in such a case).

Rav Melachyo said: One *Baraisa* taught: The expression 'from its fine flour' implies that if it became deficient, however little, it is invalid; and 'from its oil' implies that if it became deficient, however little, it is invalid. Another *Baraisa* taught: The expression 'and the remainder of the *minchah*' excludes the case where the *minchah* offering or the *komeitz* became

deficient, or where nothing at all of the *levonah* was burned. Now why are two verses necessary to exclude deficient *minchah* offerings? Surely it must be that one refers to the case where the *minchah* offering became deficient before the *kemitzah*, and the other refers to the case where the remainder became deficient between the *kemitzah* and the burning of the *komeitz*. This then would refute both of Rabbi Yochanan's rulings!? [He ruled that one may replenish a *minchah* which became deficient before the *kemitzah*, and he also ruled that a *minchah* may be offered if it became deficient after the *kemitzah*!?]

The *Gemara* answers: No, one verse refers to the case where the *minchah* offering became deficient before the *kemitzah*, in which case it is valid, provided that he brings more flour from his house to replenish it, and the other refers to the case where the remainder of the *minchah* became deficient between the *kemitzah* and the burning of the *komeitz*, in which case the *halachah* is that although he may burn the *komeitz* on account of it, the remainder is forbidden to be eaten.

This is proven from that which they inquired: According to Rabbi Yochanan, who says that where the remainder of the *minchah* became deficient between the *kemitzah* and the burning of the *komeitz*, in which case the *halachah* is that he may burn the *komeitz* on account of it, what is the *halachah* with regard to the eating of the remainder? Zeiri said: It is written: 'And that which remains,' implying that only the remainder may be eaten, but not that which remains from the remainder. [If they became deficient, the remainder of that cannot be eaten.] Rabbi Yannai said: It is written: 'of the *minchah*' - that is, the *minchah* which was there at the time of the *kemitzah*. [The remainder still may be eaten, even if it became deficient.] (9a2 – 9b3)

The Mishnah had stated: If one performed *kemitzah* with his left hand etc. [it is invalid].

The *Gemara* asks: From where are these words known? Rabbi Zeira said: The verse states: And he brought near the *minchah* offering, and filled his palm from it. Now I do not know which hand was meant, but when another verse states: And the Kohen shall take of the log of oil, and pour it into the palm of his own left hand, [I know that] only here ['palm' means] the left palm, but elsewhere wherever 'palm' is stated it means the right. - But isn't this expression required for its own purpose? — 'The left palm' is mentioned once again. - But shouldn't I apply here the principle: 'a limitation followed by a limitation extends the scope of the law'¹? — 'The left palm' is mentioned yet once again; so that we may say that only here ['palm' means] the left palm, whereas elsewhere ['palm'] cannot mean the left palm. - Perhaps I should say quite the contrary: just as here ['palm' means] the left palm so elsewhere ['palm' means] the left palm! — 'The left palm' is in fact stated four times: twice in the case of the poor man and twice in the case of the rich man. (9b3 – 9b4)

DAILY MASHAL

Rights

Rabbi Shimon Sofer zt"l, the Rabbi of Krakow, represented the Jews in parliament and his place was to the left side of the hall. Once a gentile representative asked him why he chose the left side. Rabbi Sofer wisely replied that right (recht) means both the right side and rights, whereas, "We Jews have no rights at all."

¹ Since 'the left palm' is stated twice, and inasmuch as each by itself serves as a limitation to exclude the right palm, the result is that the successive limitations actually amplify the law and include the right

palm, that it, too, may be used in the purificatory process of the *metzora*.