



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

Menachos Daf Nun

LO HIKRIVU KEVES BABOKER...

- **Q:** Who mentioned anything about "chinuch" (inauguration) that caused the Mishna to bring up this topic? **A:** The Mishna is missing words and should say as follows. If the morning tamid was not brought, the afternoon tamid is not brought either. When is this? Only if there was no chinuch of the Mizbe'ach yet. If there was, then even if the morning tamid was not brought, the afternoon tamid would be brought. **R' Shimon** said, this is only if the morning tamid was not brought because of a shogeg or an oneis. However, if it was due to a meizid, the afternoon tamid is not brought. However, with regard to the bringing of the ketores, if the morning ketores was not brought (for any reason) the afternoon ketores is still brought.
- **Q:** How do we know that the chinuch of the outside Mizbe'ach is not done with the afternoon tamid? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the establishing of the Mishkan says "v'eis hakeves hasheini taaseh bein ha'arbayim". This teaches that the afternoon tamid may not be the first one of the day. This is only if the chinuch of the Mizbe'ach was not yet done. If it was, then the afternoon tamid is brought even if it is the first tamid of the day. **R' Shimon** said, this is only if the morning tamid was not brought due to a shogeg or oneis. If it was due to a meizid, the afternoon tamid would also not be brought. With regard to the ketores, even if there was no chinuch of the inside Mizbe'ach, and even if the morning ketores was not brought due to a meizid, the afternoon ketores is still brought.
 - **Q:** The Kohanim sinned by not bringing the morning tamid, but should that cause the Mizbe'ach to sit idle without the afternoon tamid as well? **A:** **Rava** said, **R' Shimon** means that the Kohanim who sinned may not bring the afternoon tamid, but other Kohanim would bring the afternoon tamid.
 - With ketores we don't penalize the bringing of the afternoon ketores based on the not having brought the morning ketores (as we do for the tamid), because ketores is something that is not brought often and it is something that brings wealth to the Kohen who offers it. Therefore, the Kohanim hold it dear and are very careful to bring it properly and there is no need for a penalty.

AMAR R' SHIMON V'KULA HU'YSA KREIVA BEIN HA'ARBAYIM...

- **Q:** The Mishna said that the chinuch of the inside Mizbe'ach is only done with the afternoon ketores. However, a Braisa says that it is done with the morning ketores!? **A:** This is a machlokes between Tanna'im.
 - **Abaye** said, it seems reasonable that the afternoon ketores is how the chinuch was done. The pasuk says that the ketores should be burned when the menorah is cleaned. This teaches us to compare the ketores to the menorah. Now, the menorah can only be cleaned if it was first lit in the evening, which means that the chinuch of the menorah was in the evening. We learn from here that the chinuch of the inside Mizbe'ach must also be done in the evening with the afternoon ketores.
 - The view that says that the chinuch of the inside Mizbe'ach is done with the morning ketores is based on learning the inside Mizbe'ach from the outside Mizbe'ach – just as there the chinuch is done with the morning tamid, so too here, the chinuch is done with the morning ketores.

V'LO ES HASHULCHAN ELAH B'LECHEM HAPANIM B'SHABBOS

- **Q:** This suggests that the chinuch of the Shulchan cannot take place during the week, but that the challos can become kadosh during the week. We know that this is not true!? **A:** The Mishna is teaching that the chinuch and the making kadosh can both only take place on Shabbos.
- A Braisa says, "This was a case of ketores offered by a yachid on the outside Mizbe'ach (as opposed to the daily ketores which was offered by the tzibbur on the inside Mizbe'ach)".

- **Q:** What is the case referred to in the Braisa? **A: R' Pappa** said, it refers to the Nesi'im, who each brought ketores as part of their korbos at the time of the setting up of the Mishkan.
- **Q:** The Braisa seems to imply that it is only on the outside Mizbe'ach that we won't find an individual bringing ketores, but that it is something we would find on the inside Mizbe'ach!? Also, it implies that a *yachid* doesn't bring on the outside Mizbe'ach, but that a *tzibbur* may!? A Braisa clearly says that both of these things would be assur!? **A: R' Pappa** said, the Braisa means to say, the *tzibbur* certainly cannot bring ketores on the outside Mizbe'ach, because we never find that the *tzibbur* did so, and a *yachid* certainly cannot bring ketores on the inside Mizbe'ach, because we never find that a *yachid* did so. Even more, a *yachid* cannot bring ketores on the outside Mizbe'ach, even though we find that the Nesi'im did so.

MISHNA

- The chavitin of the Kohen Gadol (the daily mincha that he brought) was not brought in halves (even though it was divided into halves and brought half in the morning and half in the afternoon). Rather, he brings a full issaron and divides it, and offers half in the morning and half in the afternoon.
 - If a Kohen Gadol offered the half in the morning and then died and another Kohen Gadol was appointed that day, he may not simply bring a half issaron from his house for the afternoon offering, nor may he simply use the remaining half of the first Kohen Gadol. Rather, he must bring a full issaron and divide it in half. He then offers half and the other half is destroyed. The result is that two halves are offered (the first half of the previous Kohen Gadol and half of the new Kohen Gadol) and two halves are destroyed (the second half of the first Kohen Gadol and the remaining half of the new Kohen Gadol).

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the words in the pasuk "machatzisah baboker umachatzisah ba'erev" teach that the Kohen Gadol must bring a full issaron, and divide it in half, with one half brought in the morning and the other half brought in the afternoon. If the half set aside for the afternoon became tamei or was lost, we would think that he simply brings another half issaron and offers it. The pasuk of "umachatzisah ba'erev" teaches that he must bring a full issaron, divide it in half, with half to be offered and the other half to be destroyed. The result is that two halves are offered and two halves are destroyed (the one that was lost and the second half of the new issaron). If a Kohen Gadol offered the half in the morning and then died and another Kohen Gadol was appointed that day, he may not simply bring a half issaron from his house for the afternoon offering, nor may he simply use the remaining half of the first Kohen Gadol. Rather, the pasuk of "umachatzisah ba'erev" teaches that he must bring a full issaron and divide it in half. He then offers half and the other half is destroyed. The result is that two halves are offered and two halves are destroyed.
- **Q:** A Braisa was taught in front of **R' Nachman** that said, the half that was not offered by the first Kohen Gadol and the half that was not offered by the second Kohen Gadol are left overnight to become nassar and are then taken out to be burned. **R' Nachman** said, the half of the first Kohen Gadol was fit to be offered by him, so it makes sense that we would not destroy it until it becomes passul as nassar. However, the half of the second Kohen Gadol was never going to be offered, so why must it be left to become passul before being destroyed? **A:** This view follows the **Tanna Divei Rabbah bar Avuha**, who holds that even piggul must be left overnight to become nassar before it is burned. **A2: R' Ashi** said, the view may even follow the **Rabanan** (who say that piggul could be burned immediately). However, since when the second Kohen Gadol brought the full issaron and divided it, he could have chosen either half to be offered, it is considered to have been fit to be offered, and therefore must be left overnight to become nassar before being destroyed.
- **Q:** How were the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol prepared? **A: R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Chanina** said it is first baked and then fried. **R' Assi in the name of R' Chanina** said it is first fried and then baked.

- **R' Chiya bar Abba** said, my view is more reasonable based on the pasuk of "tufinei", which he darshens to teach that it should have a nice appearance (it therefore must first be baked first, because if it was fried first it would become black). **R' Assi** said, my view is more reasonable based on the pasuk of "tufinei", which he darshens to teach that it should be partially cooked before it is baked, which means that it should be fried before it is baked.
 - This is actually a machlokes among Tanna'im. There is a Braisa where the **T"K** darshens the pasuk to teach that it should be partially cooked before it is baked, **Rebbi** darshens it to teach that it should have a nice appearance, and **R' Dosa** says it should be baked, then fried, then baked again (first explanation of Rashi), because he darshens the pasuk in both ways, and says that both can be accomplished if it is first baked, then fried, and then baked again.