



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

Menachos Daf Nun Daled

- A Braisa says, one may not make the Tamid or Shte'i Halechem chametz by putting in apples. In the name of **R' Chanina ben Gamliel** they said that this may be done.
 - **R' Kahana** had a version of the Braisa that said that it was **R' Chanina ben Tradyon** who argued.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that if a crushed apple of terumah was put into a dough of chullin and caused it to become chametz, it is assur to be eaten by a non-Kohen. Must we say that the Mishna only follows **R' Chanina**? **A:** The Mishna can even follow the **Rabanan**. Although they hold that it doesn't make it fully chametz, it does make it partially chametz, and therefore it would make it assur to a non-Kohen.
- **R' Eila** said, the most difficult mincha to make a kemitza with is a chatas mincha (which is dry flour). **R' Yitzchak bar Avdimi** said, one may knead the chatas mincha with water and it is valid (so the kemitza is not so difficult).
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that they are arguing as follows. **R' Yitzchak** holds that we assess the amount of the flour for the kometz as it is now, and therefore water may be added, and **R' Eila** holds that we assess it as it was in its dry state, and therefore water can't be added before kemitza? **A:** It may be that all agree that we assess it as it is now. The machlokes is that **R' Yitzchak** holds that when the pasuk says that the chatas mincha must be "dry" it means dry from oil, but water may be added, whereas **R' Eila** holds that it means that it must be dry even from water.
- A Mishna regarding food tumah says, if the meat of a calf swelled (to the size of an egg, which is what is needed for tumah) and if the meat of an older animal shriveled (to smaller than an egg), they are assessed as they were. **Rav, R' Chiya, and R' Yochanan** say the Mishna means they are assessed *as they are now*. **Shmuel, R' Shimon bar Rebbi, and Reish Lakish** say it means that they are assessed *as they were initially*.
 - **Q:** A Braisa clearly says that we look at the size of the calf's meat in its current state and it therefore becomes tamei (when it swelled to the size of an egg)!? **A:** That is D'Rabanan.
 - **Q:** The Braisa then says that the same halacha applies to piggul and nossar. Now, there is no piggul and nossar D'Rabanan, which seems to show that the Braisa is discussing D'Oraisa!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to the Rabbinic tumah that piggul and nossar give to one who touches them.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if the meat was the size of an egg and then shrank to less than the size of an egg it is tahor from that point forward. This is a kula, which must mean that it is even D'Oraisa that we say this!? **A:** **Rabbah** said, really all agree that if the meat was the size of an egg and then shrank to less than that size, since it is now less than that size it would not become tamei. Also, all agree that if it was smaller and then swelled to the size of an egg, it would become tamei D'Rabanan. The machlokes is where it was initially the size of an egg, then shrank to less than the size of an egg, and then swelled back to the size of an egg. In that case **Shmuel's** group holds that there is rejection regarding issurim, and therefore once it shrank to less than an egg it can no longer become tamei, even if it swelled to the size of an egg. **Rav's** group holds that there is no rejection regarding issurim, and therefore, if it again is the size of an egg, it can again become tamei.
 - **Q:** A Mishna clearly says that if food the size of an egg shrank to less than that size in the sun, and then swelled back to that size in the rain, it can again become tamei!? This refutes the view that there is the concept of rejection regarding issurim. **TEYUFTA**.

- **Q:** A Braisa says, we separate maaser from fresh figs for dry figs by number. Now, this makes sense if we say that we assess based on the initial size (which would mean that we view the dried figs as being fresh, so taking one fresh fig for 9 dried figs is $1/10$ of the volume). However, if we assess based on current size, we are taking double the volume that we should be taking for maaser, and a Braisa says that taking too much maaser is ok for the produce that it is taken for, but makes the maaser assur to be eaten!? **A:** The Braisa then says that we take maaser from dried figs for fresh figs based on volume rather than number. Now, if we say that we assess based on the current size, this makes sense. However, if we say that we assess based on initial size, we will be taking too much maaser, which makes the maaser assur to eat!? Rather, we must say that the Braisa is not referring to maaser, but is referring to terumah, which one may take even more than is required.
 - **Q:** The Braisa then says that **R' Elazar the son of R' Yose** said that his father would take 10 dried figs and separate them for 90 fresh figs. Terumah is separated between $1/40$ to $1/60$, not $1/10$, so the Braisa can't be referring to terumah!? **A:** Rather, the Braisa is discussing terumas maaser (which is $1/10$ of the maaser and must be given to the Kohen), and the Braisa follows **Abba Elazar ben Gomel**, who based on a Braisa would seem to hold that one may give more than the required amount, just as one may do for regular terumah.
 - **Q:** Based on this, how was **R' Elazar the son of R' Yose's** father able to take 10 dried figs for 90 fresh figs? We can understand this based on the view that we assess the size as they were initially, but how can we understand this based on the view that we assess based on the current size? **A:** **R' Dimi in the name of R' Elazar** said, dried figs are different than other things that shrink, because they can be cooked and blown back up to their initial size. Therefore, they are viewed at their initial size.