



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

Menachos Daf Chuf Zayin

MISHNA

- With regard to the kometz, its smaller part is essential to its larger part.
- With regard to the issaron of flour, its smaller part is essential to its larger part.
- With regard to the wine of nesachim, its smaller part is essential to its larger part.
- With regard to the oil, its smaller part is essential to its larger part.
- The flour and the oil are essential to each other,
- The kometz and the levonah are essential to each other.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is the smaller part of the kometz essential to its larger part? **A:** The Torah says "milo kumtzo" twice, which teaches that it is essential.
- **Q:** Why is the smaller part of the issaron essential to its larger part? **A:** The Torah says "misaltah", which teaches that if anything is missing it is passul.
- **Q:** Why is the smaller part of the wine essential to its larger part? **A:** The Torah says "kacha", which teaches that it is essential.
- **Q:** Why is the smaller part of the oil essential to its larger part? **A:** Regarding minchas nesachim the pasuk says "kacha". Regarding a minchas nedavah the pasuk says "umishamnah".
- **Q:** Why are the flour and oil essential to each other? **A:** The Torah says "misaltah umishamnah" and then says "migirsa umishamnah". The repetition teaches that they are essential.
- **Q:** Why are the kometz and levonah essential to each other? **A:** The Torah says "ahl kol livonasah" and then says "v'eis kol halevonah". The repetition teaches that they are essential.

MISHNA

- The two Yom Kippur goats are essential to each other.
- The two Shavuot lambs are essential to each other.
- The Shte Halechem are essential to each other.
- The two arrangements of the Lechem Hapanim are essential to each other.
- The two spoons of levonah on the Shulchan are essential to each other.
- The arrangements and the spoons of levonah are essential to each other.
- The two types of breads in the korbanos of the nazir, the three items used in the avodah of the Parah Adumah, the four kinds of breads of a Todah, the four parts of the lulav, and the four parts used in the tahara process of a metzora, are all essential to each other.
- The seven sprinklings of the Parah Adumah are essential to each other.
- The seven sprinklings that are done between the poles of the Aron, on the paroches, and on the Golden Mizbe'ach, are essential to each other.

GEMARA

- The sources for the items listed in the Mishna are as follows:
 - The two Yom Kippur goats – the pasuk uses the term "chukah".
 - The two Shavuot lambs – the pasuk uses the term "havayah".
 - The Shte Halechem – the pasuk uses the term "havayah".
 - The two arrangements of the Lechem Hapanim – the pasuk uses the term "chukah".
 - The two spoons of levonah – the pasuk uses the term "chukah".
 - The arrangements and the spoons of levonah – the pasuk uses the term "chukah".
 - The two breads used by a nazir – the pasuk says "kein yaaseh".
 - The three items used for the parah adumah – the pasuk says "chukah".
 - The 4 breads of a todah – there is a hekesheh to nazir.

- The 4 items used for the metzora – the pasuk says “zos tihyeh Toras hametzora”.
- The 4 items used for a lulav – the pasuk says “ulikachtem”, which teaches that it must be a “complete taking”.
 - **R’ Chanan bar Rava** said, it is only essential that he have all four species. If he has them, but they are not bundled together, that is not essential and he will be yotzeh.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that one is not yotzeh unless that are all taken together in one bundle!? **A:** It is a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says that a lulav is valid whether or not it is bundled with the other species, but **R’ Yehuda** says it is passul if it is not bundled with the other species.
 - **R’ Yehuda** learns a gezeira shava of “kicha” from the Yidden’s taking of the bundle of “eizov” in Mitzrayim, which teaches that it must be bundled together. The **Rabanan** don’t learn this gezeira shava.
 - A Braisa says, it is a mitzvah to bundle the lulav with the other species, but if it was not done it is still valid. This follows the **Rabanan**. Although the **Rabanan** didn’t even say that it is a mitzvah to bundle them, it is a mitzvah to do so just based on “zeh Eili v’anveihu”.
- The 7 sprinklings of the parah adumah – the pasuk uses the term “chukah”.
- The 7 sprinklings that are done between the poles of the Aron, on the paroches, and on the Golden Mizbe’ach:
 - Regarding the sprinklings of Yom Kippur the pasuk says “chukah”.
 - Regarding the sprinklings of the Kohen Gadol’s par, the par helam davar shel tzibbur, and the goats for a chatas for avodah zara, we learn from a Braisa that learns from the pasuk of “v’asa lapar kasher asah l’par” that they are essential.
- A Braisa says, the 7 sprinklings for the parah adumah that were done not for their own sake or not directed towards the entrance of the Heichal, are passul. The sprinklings of the korbanos brought in the Heichal and of the oil of a metzora that were done not for their sake are passul. If they were not directed towards the entrance of the Heichal they are valid.
 - **Q:** Another Braisa says, that regarding the sprinklings of the parah adumah, if they were done not for their sake they are passul, but if they were not directed towards the entrance of the Heichal they are valid!? **A:** **R’ Chisda** said, the first Braisa follows **R’ Yehuda** and the second Braisa follows the **Rabanan**, as we find in a Braisa. The Braisa discusses the chiyuv for a person who walks into the different parts of the Mikdash complex. The Braisa says that there is a machlokes, based on how to darshen a pasuk, regarding a person who walked into the Kodosh Hakodashim, but who did not approach the Aron – **R’ Yehuda** says he would be chayuv malkus and the **Rabanan** say he would be chayuv misah bidei Shamayim. The machlokes is based on whether we understand the word “ehl” of “ehl pnei hakapores” is to be understood to be limited to specifically that case, whereas the **Rabanan** don’t say that. Therefore, regarding the sprinkling of the parah adumah towards the entrance of the Heichal, where the pasuk says “v’hizah ehl nochach” the same machlokes would apply. According to **R’ Yehuda** we understand this as limiting the sprinklings to have to be directed towards the entrance of the Heichal (which is the view of the first Braisa) and according to the **Rabanan** it would be valid even if this was not done (which is the view of the second Braisa).
 - **Q:** **R’ Yosef** asked, based on what we have said, **R’ Yehuda** should darshen the word “ahl” in a similar way, and when the pasuk says that on Yom Kippur the blood should be sprinkled “ahl pnei hakapores” it should mean that the only way to do this is to actually put it on the kapores. If so, during the Second Beis Hamikdash, where there was no Aron or kapores he should not have done these sprinklings!? **A:** **Rabbah bar Ulla** said, the pasuk of “v’chiper es mikdash haKodesh” teaches that the sprinkling must be done at the place where the kapores was, but need not actually be done on the kapores itself.
 - **Rava** said, that both Braisos follow the view of the **Rabanan**. The second Braisa is referring to where the Kohen sprinkled with his back to the East and facing

the West. The first Braisa refers to where the Kohen sprinkled facing north or south.

- **Q:** The Braisa said that the sprinklings of the korbanos brought in the Heichal and of the oil of a metzora that were done not for their sake are passul. If they were not directed towards the entrance of the Heichal they are valid. However, another Braisa says that even if they were done not for their sake they are valid!? **A: R' Yosef** said, the first Braisa follows the view of **R' Eliezer** who makes a hekesh between a chatas and an asham (regarding lishma) and therefore also makes a hekesh between the oil of a metzora and an asham (and therefore requires that the oil be done lishma), and the second Braisa follows the view of the **Rabanan** who do not make this hekesh.
 - **Q:** Even according to **R' Eliezer**, how can something that itself was learned through a hekesh (lishma for an asham) then teach further through a hekesh? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, that both Braisos follow the **Rabanan**. The second Braisa is referring to the validity of the korbon. The first Braisa is referring to whether it fulfills the metzora's obligation.