



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

Menachos Daf Nun Aleph

- A Mishna says, with regard to the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol, its kneading, its shaping, and its baking were done in the Azarah, and they may be done on Shabbos.
 - **Q:** How do we know this? **A: R' Huna** said, the pasuk says "tufinei", which is darshened to mean that it should have a nice appearance, and if it the chavitin for Shabbos were baked before Shabbos it would become blown up with air and would not be fresh. Therefore, it must be made on Shabbos.
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, why can't it be made before Shabbos and wrapped in vegetation, which would prevent these things from happening to it? **A:** Rather, the yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** said, that the pasuk says "tei'aseh" which teaches that it may be made even on Shabbos, and even if tamei. **A2: Abaye** said, the pasuk says "soles mincha tamid", which teaches that the chavitin is like the mincha of the Korbon Tamid – just as the tamid and its mincha override Shabbos and tumah, the same is true for the chavitin. **A3: Rava** said, the pasuk of "ahl machavas" teaches that a kli shareis is used in the making of the chavitin, and therefore, if it is made before Shabbos it would become passul with "linah" when left overnight. Therefore, it must be made on Shabbos.
 - There is a Braisa that supports **Rava**. The Braisa says, "ahl machavas" teaches that the chavitin must be made using a kli shareis. The extra word "bashemen" comes to add on the amount of oil that is needed. The question is, how much more than the typical lug of oil should be used? The pasuk by the minchas nesachim of the tamid also says "shemen", and we learn from there, that just as there we use 3 lugim of oil per issaron of flour, the same is here. On the other hand, it also says "shemen" by a minchas nedavah, so maybe we should say that just as there only one lug is used for each issaron, the same should be for the chavitin? The chavitin are more similar to the tamid in that they are both tadir, both override Shabbos, and both override tumah. Maybe say that chavitin is more similar to minchas nedavah, because they are both offerings by a yachid, are brought on their own (not as an accompaniment to a korbon), and both are brought with levonah? **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yochanan ben Broka** says, the pasuk of "soles mincha tamid" teaches that the chavitin is like a tamid – just as the tamid uses 3 lugim per issaron, the same is done for the chavitin. **R' Shimon** says, the Torah increased the amount of oil to be used for the chavitin, and the Torah increased the amount of oil to be used for the tamid – just as the tamid uses 3 lugim per issaron, the same is done for the chavitin. The Braisa asks, maybe we should say that the Torah also increased the amount of oil to be used for the parim and rams, and just as there it is only 2 lugim per issaron, it should be the same for chavitin!? We learn the case of chavitin, which is brought of one issaron, from the case of tamid, which is also brought of one issaron, rather than learn it from the mincha of parim and rams, where more than one issaron is brought.
 - **Q:** First the Braisa says that the word "bashemen" teaches that more oil than usual must be used, but then asks that maybe it should be like a minchas nedavah, which would mean that no more oil than usual is used!? **A: Abaye** said, the view that "bashemen" indicates that more than the typical amount of oil should be used is the view of **R' Shimon**, and the one who suggests that it should be the same amount of oil as a minchas nedavah is the view of **R' Yishmael**. **A2: R' Huna the son of R'**

Yehoshua said that the entire beginning of the Braisa is the view of **R' Yishmael**, who at first thought to say that “bashemen” must be coming to teach a requirement for additional oil, because it is obvious that it needs *some* oil and the word can't be coming to teach that it simply needs *some* oil. Then he thought to say that maybe it is not obvious that it needs *some* oil, and the word is simply telling us that it does need *some* oil, and that is why he ultimately needed to learn the additional oil requirement from the pasuk of “soles mincha tamid”. **A3: Rabbah** said that the entire beginning of the Braisa follows the view of **R' Shimon**, who at first thought to say that although “bashemen” teaches that additional oil is required, we would know this even without the word “bashemen”, based on his comparison to a tamid. Since that was refuted, he then realized that we need the “bashemen” to teach this extra oil requirement.

MISHNA

- If they did not appoint a new Kohen Gadol after one had died, who would pay for the chavitin? **R' Shimon** says it is paid for by the tzibbur. **R' Yehuda** says it is paid for by the Kohen Gadol's heirs. In this case it is offered whole (the full issaron, not halved).

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if a Kohen Gadol died and no replacement was appointed, how do we know that the daily chavitin is paid for by the heirs? The pasuk says “v'haKohen hamoshiach tachtav mibanav yaaseh osah”. We would think that it should be brought halved. The pasuk says “osah”, which means it is brought whole. This is the view of **R' Yehuda**. **R' Shimon** says, “chak olam” teaches that it should be brought by the tzibbur. The pasuk of “kalil taktar” teaches that it should be entirely burned on the Mizbe'ach.
 - **Q:** The pasuk of “v'haKohen hamoshiach tachtav mibanav” is used by another Braisa to teach a different drasha!? **A:** The fact that the pasuk says “*mibanav*” allows for the second drasha.
 - **R' Shimon** says that “osah” is used to teach that if the Kohen Gadol died after bringing the morning chavitin and a replacement is appointed, the new Kohen Gadol may not use the remaining half issaron of the previous Kohen Gadol and may not bring a new half issaron. Rather, he must bring a full issaron and only offer half. He does not learn this from “*umachatzisah*” (as we did previously) because he does not darshen a “*vuv*”.
 - **R' Yehuda** says that “chak olam” teaches that this applies to all generations, that the Kohen Gadol must bring the chavitin every single day. He says the “kalil taktar” is written to create a gezeira shava between the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol and the mincha of a regular Kohen, which teaches that just as there is a lav to eat the mincha of a regular Kohen, there is a lav to eat from the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol as well, and just as the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol is entirely burned, the same is true for the mincha of a regular Kohen.
 - **Q: R' Shimon** learns from a pasuk that the tzibbur pays. Does he really hold it is D'Oraisa? There is a Mishna where **R' Shimon** says that this is a Rabbinic enactment!?! **A: R' Avahu** said, D'Oraisa it is the tzibbur who must pay for it. When there came a time when the communal fund had no money, the **Rabanan** enacted that the heirs should pay for it. When they then saw that they were negligent in paying for it, they put it back to the D'Oraisa status, that the tzibbur must pay.
 - We find a similar concept regarding the ashes of the parah adumah, which D'Oraisa is not subject to me'ilah, and the **Rabanan** then enacted that it is subject to me'ilah, and then later went back to the D'Oraisa status and said that it is not subject to me'ilah.