



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

### Menachos Daf Yud Tes

- The Gemara just said that our Mishna (the **Rabanan**) holds that the pouring of the oil may even be done by a non-Kohen, and **R' Shimon** says it may only be done by a Kohen.
  - **Q:** What is the reasoning of the **Rabanan**? **A:** The pasuk says that oil should be poured on it and levonah should be put on it and it should be brought to the Bnei Aharon the Kohanim and he should take the kometz. This teaches that from the kemitza and forward it must be done by a Kohen, but the mixing and pouring of the oil is even valid when done by a non-Kohen.
  - **Q:** What is the reasoning of **R' Shimon**? **A:** The pasuk says "Bnei Aharon Hakohanim", but is darshened as teaching regarding the part earlier (the pouring) and the part after (the kemitza).
    - **Q:** A Braisa says, we darshen the pasuk that says "b'etzba'oh" and "v'lakach" to teach that just as the "etzbah" refers to the finger on his right hand, so too the kabbalah must be done with his right hand. The pasuk also says "v'nossan", which teaches that the putting of the blood on the Mizbe'ach must also be done with the right hand. **R' Shimon** said, the pasuk doesn't say "yad" regarding kabbalah. Rather, it only says "etzba'oh" and "v'nossan", which teaches that the putting of the blood must be done with the right hand. However, since it doesn't say "yad" regarding kabbalah, it is even valid if done with the left hand. **Abaye** explains that the machlokes is based on whether we say that we darshen a pasuk as referring to earlier or to later. From here we see that **R' Shimon** does not say that it is darshened both ways!? **A:** Rather, the reason of **R' Shimon** is based on the word "**vehevi'a**" (and he shall bring to the Kohen). This "vuv" connects this to the previous and teaches that just as the kemitza must be done by a Kohen the pouring must be done by a Kohen as well.
      - **Q:** If **R' Shimon** holds this way he should similarly darshen the pasuk of "v'shachat es ben habakar...vihikrivu" to teach that just as the kabbalah must be done by a Kohen, the "vuv" should teach that the shechita must be done by a Kohen as well!? **A:** The matter of shechita is different, because there is a hekesh of "v'samach" to "v'shachat" which teaches that just as the semicha is done by a non-Kohen, the shechita may also be done by a non-Kohen.
        - **Q:** Maybe we should say that just as the semicha must be done by the owner, the shechita must be done by the owner as well? **A:** We would not say that, based on a kal v'chomer – if zrika, which is the main part of the kapparah, does not have to be done by the owner, then the shechita certainly does not have to be done by the owner. If you will ask that this can't be learned from zrika, because zrika must be done by a Kohen, we can say that we learn from Yom Kippur, where the pasuk teaches that the Kohen Gadol must shecht his korbon, that it is only there that the owner must shecht his korbon, but other korbanos do not need to be shechted by their owner.
- **Rav** said, whenever the Torah says the words "torah" and "chukah" it comes to teach that that halacha is essential. The Gemara initially understands this to mean that in order to teach that it is essential, both these words must be written, for example as it is written in the pasuk of "zos chukas hatorah".

- **Q:** Regarding nazir the pasuk only says “torah” and yet **Rav** says that tenufa is essential!? **A:** The pasuk there says “kein yaaseh”, which teaches that it is essential.
- **Q:** Regarding todah the pasuk only says “torah” and yet a Mishna teaches that all 4 types of breads are essential!? **A:** Todah is different, because it is compared to nazir.
- **Q:** Regarding metozra the pasuk only says “torah” and yet a Mishna says that all 4 things are essential in the metzora process!? **A:** The pasuk there says “tihyeh”, which teaches that it is essential.
- **Q:** Regarding Yom Kippur the pasuk only says “chukah” and yet a Mishna says that the two goats are essential!? **A:** Rather, **Rav** meant that if the pasuk says “torah” *or* “chukah” it means it is essential.
  - **Q:** All other korbanos say the word “torah” and not all the details are essential!? **A:** The word torah still requires that the word chukah be written to teach that it is essential, but the word chukah teaches it is essential even if the word torah is not written.
    - **Q:** **Rav** said that torah and chukah are both equal in teaching that something is essential!? **A:** **Rav** was saying that even if the word torah is written, if it also says chukah it teaches that it is essential, but if it does not say chukah then it does not teach that it is essential.
    - **Q:** Regarding a mincha the pasuk says chukah, and yet **Rav** says that if a halacha is repeated that means it is essential. This suggests that if it is not repeated it is not considered to be essential even though it says chukah!? **A:** The word chukah is only written regarding the eating of the mincha, not the other avodos.
    - **Q:** Regarding the Lechem Hapanim the pasuk also says chukah only in regard to the eating, and yet a Mishna says that all aspects are essential – the two arrangements, the two spoons of levonah, etc. We see that even when it is written regarding the eating it is to be understood as teaching that *everything* is essential!? **A:** The fact that all is essential is not learned from chukah – it is learned from the fact that the Torah writes “its flour” and “its oil”.
- We stated above that **Rav** says that whenever the Torah repeats something regarding the mincha it is to teach that it is essential. **Shmuel** argues and says that the requirement of the fine flour and the oil are essential, but nothing else is.
  - **Q:** Does **Shmuel** hold that a repeated halacha in the Torah is not meant to teach that it is essential? **A:** Rather, a repeated halacha certainly teaches that it is essential. The machlokes between them is whether we learn that something is essential from the pesukim of “melo kumtzo” and “b’kumtzo”. **Rav** says that this teaches that the kemitza must be done by hand, and we are also taught that Aharon did kemitza by hand, and therefore we are taught that it is essential. **Shmuel** says we can’t learn the halacha for future generations from a one-time mincha (of Aharon), and therefore it is not repeated and is not essential.
    - **Q:** We find that **Shmuel** does learn a halacha from the menachos of the Nesi’im (which was a one-time mincha)!? **A:** That case is different, because the pasuk is repeated 12 times (once for each Nasi). That is why he learns from that case.
  - **Q:** **R’ Kahana** and **R’ Assi** asked **Rav**, the Torah repeats the halacha of hagasha and yet it is not essential!? It is repeated in the pasuk of “Zos toras hamincha hakreiv osah Bnei Aharon lifnei Hashem”!? **A:** That pasuk is needed to teach which side of the Mizbe’ach the mincha is to be brought to. As a Braisa says, the pasuk says that the mincha should be brought “lifnei Hashem” (which means the west side of the Mizbe’ach) and also says “ehl pnei hamizbe’ach” (which means the south side). Therefore, we learn that it should be brought to the southwest corner. **R’ Eliezer** says that it was brought on the south side of that corner (not on the corner itself), because he says that the entire Mizbe’ach was on the northern half of the Azarah, and therefore even the south side of the southwest corner is considered to be “lifnei Hashem”, since it was opposite the

opening to the Heichal. In this way, by bringing it to the south side of the corner he has fulfilled both pesukim.