



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Menachos, Daf אָד – Daf אָד

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

#### -----Daf אָד---41-----

- A Braisa says, a garment that is worn folded is chayuv in tzitzis (at the fold), and **R' Shimon** says it is patur (but should instead have the tzitzis put at the actual corners of the unfolded garment). They both agree that if it was folded and sewn down that it would be chayuv in tzitzis (at the fold).
  - **Q:** It is obvious that it is chayuv if it was sewn down!? **A:** The Braisa is teaching that even if it was sewn with wide stiches (not proper stitching) it is chayuv.
  - **Rava bar R' Nachman** was wearing a folded garment that had tzitzis at the fold (as per the **T"K**). The garment unfolded, with the result that the tzitzis were then in middle of the garment, near his head. **Rabbah bar Huna** said, that is not the corner that the Torah says is chayuv in tzitzis. **Rava** then took off the garment and put on a different one. **Rabbah** said, tzitzis is not a personal obligation, it is an obligation on the garment, and therefore you must fix the tzitzis of the garment that you just removed.
    - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof to this from the Chassidim Harishonim, who would put tzitzis onto a garment before it was even ready to be worn. **A:** There is no proof from there. They were more machmir on themselves.
    - This view would seem to argue on that of a Malach who told **R' Katina**, in the summer you wear a linen garment (which we have said is not chayuv in tzitzis) and in the winter you wear a woolen garment with rounded corners, so you never fulfil the mitzvah of tzitzis! **R' Katina** asked, does one get punished for not fulfilling an assei? The Malach said, when there is a time of Anger in Heaven one can get punished for not doing an assei. Now, if we say that tzitzis is a personal obligation it would make sense that the Malach was saying that he can get punished for not having tzitzis. However, if we say it is an obligation of the garment, why would a person get punished for that?
      - This is no proof. Even if it is a personal chiyuv he would not be punished for not having tzitzis on a garment that does not need tzitzis! Rather, the Malach was telling him that it looks like he is trying to find a way to be patur from tzitzis.
    - **R' Tuvi bar Kisna in the name of Shmuel** said, garments that are lying in a draw are chayuv in tzitzis. However, the shrouds used to bury a meis do not get tzitzis. The Gemara says that we would put tzitzis onto shrouds so as not to embarrass the dead.
- **Rachva in the name of R' Yehuda** said, if a garment tore more than 3 etzba'os from the corner, it may be sewn. If it tore within 3 etzba'os to the corner, it may not be sewn (since this is the place where the tzitzis are to be put, we are concerned that he will leave over threads from the sewing and use that as tzitzis, which is passul).
  - A Braisa says this as well. The Braisa says, if a garment tore more than 3 etzba'os from the corner, it may be sewn. If it tore within 3 etzba'os to the corner, **R' Meir** says it may not be sewn and the **Chachomim** say that it may be sewn. They both agree that a person should not replace a torn off corner with a piece that already has the tzitzis on it, even if that piece was a square amah. They also agree that one may take the tzitzis off another garment and put it onto a different garment as long as the strings are not torn.
    - **Q:** Can we prove from here that we may untie tzitzis from one garment for another? **A:** It may be that the Braisa is discussing where the garment was all worn out, and only then is it mutar.
- A Braisa says, if a garment is made of techeiles, the two strings that normally must be white can be of any color, except that they may not be of blue dye of a tree.
  - **Q:** Another Braisa discusses the same type of garment and says that if blue dye of a tree is used it will be valid!? **A:** **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the first Braisa is dealing with a garment that has only 4 strings

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

(which when looped through become 8) and the second Braisa is dealing with one that has 8 strings (which when looped through become 16).

- **Q:** Presumably the reason that we don't allow the blue dye of the tree is that one may take them from that garment and, thinking they are techeiles, put them onto another garment. Does this prove that one may transfer tzitzis from one garment to another? **A:** It may be that we don't allow it, but are concerned for the case when someone does it anyway.
- We have learned, **Rav** says we may not take tzitzis from one garment for another and **Shmuel** says that we may. **Rav** says that we may not light one Chanukah flame from another and **Shmuel** says that we may. **Rav** says that the halacha does not follow **R' Shimon** regarding "greira" (dragging a bed, chair, or bench on the ground on Shabbos, which **R' Shimon** says is mutar as long as he doesn't intend to make a groove) and **Shmuel** says that it does.
- **R' Yehuda** would give his garments with tzitzis to a launderer (without concern that the techeiles would rip and the launderer would then replace it with strings dyed with blue dye of a tree). **R' Chanina** would roll the tzitzis into a ball to make sure they don't rip. **Ravina** would sew them into the hem of the garment.
- A Braisa says, how many strings are put on the corner? **B"R** say four and **B"H** say three. How much should the loose strings hang down? **B"R** say 4 etzba'os and **B"H** say 3 etzba'os. The 3 etzba'os of **B"H** are each ¼ of a tefach of an average man.
  - **R' Pappa** said, a D'Oraisa tefach is equal to 4 etzba'os using the thumb, 6 etzba'os using the small finger, and 5 etzba'os using the third finger.
  - **R' Huna** said, that tzitzis are made of 4 folded strings, attached within 4 etzba'os to the end of the corner, and should hang down 4 etzba'os. **R' Yehuda** said, that tzitzis are made of 3 folded strings, attached within 3 etzba'os to the end of the corner, and should hang down 3 etzba'os. **R' Pappa** said, the halacha is that tzitzis are made of 4 folded strings, attached within 3 etzba'os to the end of the corner, and should hang down 4 etzba'os.
    - **Q:** Does that mean that there is a minimum required size for the tzitzis? A Braisa says that the word "tzitzis" suggests it can be of any size, and that **B"R** and **B"H** went up to the attic of **Yochanan ben Beseira** and said that tzitzis have no minimum required size and that a lulav has no minimum required size!? **A:** That means that there is no *maximum* size, but there is a minimum required size. That must be what is meant, because a Mishna clearly gives a minimum required size for a lulav.

### -----Daf כג---42-----

- A Braisa says, the word "tzitzis" refers to loose fringes, as we see in the pasuk of "b'tzitzis roshi". **Abaye** said, these strings must be separated like the hair of the Arama'im.
- A Braisa says, if one puts the tzitzis on the tip or the border of the garment, it is valid. **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** says that both these cases would be passul.
  - **Q:** Whose view does **R' Gidal in the name of Rav** follow when he says that the tzitzis should hit against the tip of the garment, based on the pasuk of "ahl kanfei bigdeyhem"? **A:** He follows **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** (who says that it can't be attached at the end).
  - **R' Yaakov in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the tzitzis should be placed the distance of the full joint of the thumb, from the end of the garment.
    - We need the ruling of **R' Pappa** (who said it should not be placed more than 3 etzba'os off the corner), because from **R' Yaakov** we would think that the further off the corner the better. We need the ruling of **R' Yaakov**, because from **R' Pappa** we would think that the closer to the end the better.
      - **R' Sama** saw that the hole in which the tzitzis of **Ravina** was placed was ripped, causing the tzitzis to be less than the joint of a thumb away from the end. He asked him, do you not hold of **R' Yaakov**? **Ravina** said, that is only when making the tzitzis, but if it rips later it is not a problem. **R' Sama** was embarrassed for not knowing that. **R' Ashi** told

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

him not to be embarrassed, because **Ravina** was from EY, and every chochom in EY is equal to two chachomim of Bavel.

- **R' Acha bar Yaakov** would fold the 4 strings in half and then put that through the hole in the garment, because he held it should go into the garment as 8 strings. **R' Yirmiya MiDifti** would put 8 strings without folding them, which would become a total of 16 when they hung out of both sides of the garment. **Mar the son of Ravina** would do like we do (put 4 strings through without folding them, which would make a total of 8 strings once they were through the garment).
- **R' Nachman** saw **R' Ada bar Ahava** make a bracha on the making of the tzitzis. He told him that **Rav** said there is no bracha made on the making of tzitzis.
  - When **R' Huna** was niftar, **R' Chisda** went into the Beis Medrash and asked, how can **Rav** have said that the making of tzitzis doesn't require a bracha? We find that **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said that tzitzis made by goyim is passul based on the pasuk of "daber ehl Bnei Yisrael...v'asu lahem tzitzis"!?
    - **Q:** Why is that a contradiction to the ruling of **Rav**? **A:** **R' Yosef** said, it is because **R' Chisda** holds that any mitzvah that is valid when done by a goy does not require a bracha when done by a Yid, but a mitzvah that is passul when done by a goy does require a bracha when done by a Yid.
      - **Q:** We find that a milah done by a goy is valid, and yet the halacha is that a Yid who does the milah must make a bracha!? **A:** We are asking according to **Rav**, and **Rav** holds that a milah done by a goy is passul.
      - **Q:** The case of succah supports **R' Yosef's** explanation, because a Braisa says that a succah built by a goy is valid, and a Braisa says that there is no bracha made on the building of a succah. However, the case of tefillin refutes **R' Yosef's** explanation, because tefillin written by a goy is passul, and yet a Yid does not make a bracha on the writing of the tefillin!? **A:** Rather, when the doing of the act is the completion of the mitzvah, like in the case of milah, a Yid makes a bracha when doing it, even though it is valid if done by a goy. When doing the act is not the completion of the mitzvah, like in the case of tefillin, even though it is passul when done by a goy, a Yid would not make a bracha when doing it. With regard to the making of tzitzis the machlokes is that **R' Chisda** holds the tzitzis is an obligation on the garment, even if it is not worn, and therefore the putting of the tzitzis is the completion of the mitzvah, whereas **R' Nachman** holds that it is an obligation on the person which is fulfilled when the garment is worn.
    - **R' Mordechai** said to **R' Ashi**, we have learned a different version of the above and have learned that **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said that tzitzis made by a goy are valid based on the pasuk of "daber ehl Bnei Yisrael...v'asu lahem tzitzis", which teaches that "tzitzis should be made for you", even by a goy.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, if one leaves strings from the making of the garment, attached at the corner for tzitzis, it is passul. However, if one takes regular threads and attaches them for the sake of tzitzis (even though they were not spun for the sake of tzitzis) it is valid. **R' Yehuda** said, when I repeated this to **Shmuel** he told me that it would be passul, because the spinning of the threads for tzitzis must be done for the sake of the tzitzis.
  - This is like a machlokes among Tanna'im in a Braisa, where the **T"K** says that the leather used for tefillin need not have been tanned for the sake of the mitzvah. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says they are passul unless they were tanned for the sake of the mitzvah.
- **Abaye** asked **R' Shmuel bar Yehuda**, how do you dye the techeiles wool? **R' Shmuel** said, we take the blood of the chilazon and some herbs, boil it in a pot, take some in an eggshell to test it on some wool, spill out whatever is left in the eggshell, and we then burn the wool that was used for the testing.
  - We learn 3 things from here: that the wool used in the test is passul, that the dyeing must be done lishma, and that the dye used for the test would make the entire pot passul.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Saying that the wool used for the test is passul is saying that the dyeing must be done lishma!? **A:** It is an explanation – the reason that the wool is passul is because the dyeing must be done lishma.
- It is actually a machlokes Tanna'im whether the dye used for the test can be used to then dye valid tzitzis. **R' Chanina ben Gamliel** says it is passul and **R' Yochanan ben Dahavai** says it is valid.

### -----Daf 43-----

- A Braisa says, there is no way to check techeiles, and it therefore may only be purchased from an expert. There is a way to check tefillin, and still they may only be purchased from an expert. Sifrei Torah and mezuzos can be checked, and they may be purchased from anybody.
  - **Q:** Why does the Braisa say that techeiles can't be checked? We find that **R' Yitzchak the son of R' Yehuda** would have a way of testing it for authenticity, as would **R' Avira**!? **A:** The Braisa means that there is no way to know if the dyeing was done for the sake of the mitzvah, and that is why it must be purchased from an expert.
    - **Mar of Mashkei** bought techeiles in the times of **R' Achai** and tested for authenticity. It passed based on the test of **R' Yitzchak**, but failed based on the test of **R' Avira**. **R' Achai** told him that the two tests are meant to complement each other. Meaning, if it passes **R' Yitzchak's** test, there is no need to test further. If it fails his test we then test based on **R' Avira's** test. They sent from EY exactly as **R' Achai** said.
    - **R' Mani** was careful to only buy techeiles based on the above chumros. An elder told him, this is how the earlier people bought techeiles as well, and it caused them to be successful in their endeavors.
  - A Braisa says, if one buys a talis with tzitzis on it from the market, if he buys it from a Yid we can presume that it is valid. If he buys it from a goy, then if the goy is a merchant, we can assume that he bought it from a Yid for resale, and it is valid, but if the goy is a private individual, it is passul. It is valid when the goy is a merchant even though the **Rabanan** said that one may not sell a talis to a goy unless he first removes the tzitzis.
    - **Q:** Why may a Yid not sell a talis with tzitzis to a goy? **A:** In one place they explained it as a gezeira that the goy may use it as a disguise when going to a zonah. **R' Yehuda** said it is because the goy will wear it, which will fool a Yid into thinking he is a Yid, and he will then travel with the goy, putting himself in danger.
  - **R' Yehuda** would put tzitzis on the four cornered garments of his wife. Also, when he put on a garment with tzitzis every morning he would make the bracha of "I'hisateif batzitzis".
    - **Q:** By putting it on the garments of his wife, this means that he held that this is not a time bound mitzvah. If so, why did he make a bracha every morning? **A:** He holds like **Rebbi**, who says that a new bracha is made on tefillin every time they are put on (even during the same day).
      - **Q:** If so, he should have made a bracha every time he put on the garment, not just once in the morning!? **A:** **R' Yehuda** was a very modest person, who would not remove his garment at all during the day. He made the bracha when he awoke and changed from his nighttime clothing to his daytime clothing.
  - A Braisa says, all are chayuv in tzitzis: Kohanim, Levi'im, Yisraelim, geirem, women, and slaves. **R' Shimon** says that women are patur, because it is a time bound mitzvah, and women are patur from time bound mitzvos.
    - **Q:** It seems obvious that Kohanim, Levi'im, and Yisraelim are chayuv!? **A:** We would think that the smuchen of shaatnez to tzitzis teaches that only one who is assur in shaatnez is chayuv in tzitzis, and since Kohanim are not assur in shaatnez when they do the Avodah, they are also never chayuv in tzitzis.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Why does **R' Shimon** say this is a time bound mitzvah? **A:** A Braisa says, “ure'isem oso” comes to exclude a nighttime garment from the mitzvah of tzitzis. You can't say that it instead excludes the garment of a blind person, because the pasuk of “asher tichaseh bah” teaches to include the garment of a blind person. It makes more sense to include the garment of a blind person, because it can be seen by other people, whereas nighttime garments cannot be seen by anybody.
  - The **Rabanan** darshen the “asher tichaseh bah” to teach that a 5 cornered garment is chayuv in tzitzis. They darshen the “ure'isem oso” to teach that by looking at the tzitzis we will be reminded of krias shemah. The reason is, that the earliest time for reading krias shema in the morning is when there is enough light to be able to differentiate between the white strings and techeiles of tzitzis. They also may use it for the drasha of another Braisa, that by looking at tzitzis one is reminded of the mitzvah of shaatnez, which is written right next to the pasuk of tzitzis.
    - Another Braisa darshens this pasuk of “ure'isem oso uz'chartem es kol mitzvos Hashem” to teach that once one is chayuv in tzitzis, he becomes chayuv in all the other mitzvos of the Torah that apply by day. This follows **R' Shimon**, who says that one is only chayuv in tzitzis during the day.
    - Another Braisa darshens this pasuk to teach that the mitzvah of tzitzis is equal to all other mitzvos of the Torah.
    - Another Braisa says, “ure'isem oso uz'chartem...v'asisem” teaches that “seeing” leads to remembering, and remembering leads to doing. **R' Shimon ben Yochai** says, whoever is careful with this mitzvah is zocheh to greet the Shechinah.
  - A Braisa says, the Yidden are beloved, for Hashem has surrounded them with mitzvos – they have tefillin on their heads and arms, tzitzis on their garments, and mezuzos on their doorways. Dovid sang about these. When he entered the bathhouse he realized that he now lacked all these mitzvos. When he realized that he still had the mitzvah of milah with him, he was happy, and when he left he sang regarding the mitzvah of milah. **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** darshens from pesukim, whoever has tefillin on his head and arm, and tzitzis on his garment, and a mezuzah on his doorway, there is a presumption that he will not sin.
  - A Braisa says, **R' Meir** asked, why is the color of techeiles special, to have it chosen for the mitzvah of tzitzis? He said that the color of tzitzis remind us of the sea, which reminds us of the Heaven, which reminds us of the Kisei Hakavod (based on pesukim).
  - A Braisa says, the punishment for not fulfilling the white strings of tzitzis is greater than the punishment for not fulfilling the mitzvah of the techeiles (because getting the white strings are so much easier to do). It is a mashal to a king who ordered one person to get an easily obtained item for him and asked another person to get a less easily obtained item for him. Neither got the item. Obviously, the first person will be punished more severely.
  - A Braisa says, **R' Meir** would say, a person is obligated to make 100 brachos each day (based on a drasha of a pasuk). **R' Chiya the son of R' Avya** would make sure to smell a lot of besamim and eat sweet things on Shabbos and Yom Tov (to help him reach the 100 brachos).
  - A Braisa says, **R' Meir** would say, a person is obligated to make 3 specific brachos each day: “she'asani Yisrael”, “shelo asani isha”, and “shelo asani bur”. **R' Acha bar Yaakov** told his son to say “shelo asani aved” in the place of “shelo asani bur”.

### -----Daf 72--44-----

- A Braisa says, with regard to the chilazon, its body is similar in color to the sea, its form is similar to a fish, and it comes up from the water once every 70 years. Its blood is used as the dye to make techeiles. Since it only comes up once in 70 years, techeiles is very expensive.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, **R' Nosson** said, “There is no small mitzvah in the Torah that is not rewarded greatly in this world. As for in Olam Habbah I don’t even know how great the reward will be!” We can learn this from the “small” mitzvah of tzitzis. It once happened that a person went to be mezaneh with a very expensive zonah. After paying and undressing, his tzitzis banged against him. This caused him to refuse to do the aveirah. When the zonah demanded to know what happened, he explained that Hashem rewards and punishes, and these tzitzis now appear to him as 4 witnesses, ready to testify to what he was about to do. This zonah was so inspired that she converted to Judaism, and married this man. We see from here the reward this person got in this world. We cannot even imagine how great is his reward in Olam Habbah.
- **R' Yehuda** said, a borrowed garment is not chayuv in tzitzis for the first 30 days. After that, it is chayuv in tzitzis.
  - A Braisa says this regarding mezuzah as well. The Braisa says that one who is living in a hotel in EY, or one who rents a house in chutz laaretz is patur from mezuzah for 30 days. After that point he is chayuv. One who rents a house in EY is chayuv in mezuzah immediately. This was enacted to promote settling in EY (once a mezuzah is put up, it may not be removed, which will incentivize the renter to stay and not abandon the house, or will incentivize another Yid to quickly come and live in this house if the renter leaves).

### TEFILA SHEL YAD EINA ME'AKEVES

- **R' Chisda** said, this is only true if he has both tefillin. However, if he only has one, each one is essential to the other. They asked **R' Chisda**, do you actually say that a person who only has one tefillin should not wear it!? **R' Chisda** said, I do not say that. If the person can't fulfil two mitzvos should he not at least fulfil one!? Initially, when **R' Chisda** made the statement, he did so out of concern that people would only buy one of the tefillin, feeling that they would fulfil the mitzvah.
- **R' Sheishes** said, a person who doesn't wear tefillin is oiver on 8 asseis, a person who doesn't wear tzitzis is oiver on 5 asseis, a Kohen who doesn't duchan is oiver on 3 asseis, a person who doesn't have a mezuzah on his doorway is oiver on 2 asseis.
  - **Reish Lakish** said, whoever wears tefillin merits long life.

### MISHNA

- The flour and oil of a minchas nesachim are not essential to the wine, and the wine is not essential to the flour and oil.
- The blood applications of a korbon on the outside Mizbe'ach are not essential to each other (if even one is done, the kaparah is achieved).

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “uminchasam v'niskeyhem”, which teaches that the mincha is brought before the nesachim. **Rebbi** says, another pasuk says “zevach unesachim”, which teaches that the nesachim are brought after the korbon, before the mincha.
  - **Rebbi** uses the other pasuk to teach that the mincha and nesachim may even be brought at night or even the following day. The **Rabanan** use the pasuk of **Rebbi** to teach the teaching of **Ze'iri**, that nesachim only become kadosh with the shechting of the korbon.
    - **Q: Rebbi and the Rabanan** each need the pesukim for the others' drasha as well!? **A:** Rather, the reason the **Rabanan** say that the mincha comes first is the pasuk of “olah umincha”, which teaches that the mincha is brought right after the olah, before the nesachim.
      - **Q:** Based on this, **Rebbi** should hold that the mincha is brought first as well!? **A:** Rather, when a minchas nesachim is brought to accompany a korbon all agree that the mincha is brought before the nesachim, based on the pasuk of “olah umincha”. The machlokes is when the minchas nesachim is brought by itself (not at the same time as the korbon). The **Rabanan** hold that the mincha is brought before the nesachim, just as it is when it is brought at the same time as the korbon. **Rebbi** holds that when they are brought with the korbon, since the korbon, which is something that is eaten, was brought, we then bring the mincha, which is also something that is eaten, before moving on to the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

nesachim. However, when they are brought not at the time of the korbon, the nesachim take precedence, because it is brought along with the shira of the Levi'im.

HAMATANOS SHE' AHL MIZBE'ACH HACHITZON EIN ME'AKVOS ZU ES ZU

- A Braisa says, how do we know that for blood that is applied to the outside Mizbe'ach even one application brings the kapparah? The pasuk says “v'dam zevachecha yishafeich”, which suggests that even one pouring brings kapparah.

### -----Daf דל--45-----

MISHNA

- The parim, rams, and lambs of the korbon mussaf are not essential to each other. **R' Shimon** says, if there was enough money to buy all the parim needed for the mussaf, but not for the nesachim as well, they should instead only bring one par with the nesachim, rather than to bring multiple parim without the nesachim.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The parim and lambs of which korbon is the Mishna referring to? It can't be referring to the korbanos of Succos, because the pesukim there say “kamishpat” and “kimishpatam”, teaching that they are all essential!? **A:** Rather, it must be referring to the parim and lambs of Rosh Chodesh and of Shavuos.
- **Q:** Which korbon's rams is the Mishna referring to? It can't refer to Rosh Chodesh and Shavuos, because those have only one ram!? It can't refer to the Shte Halechem korbon, because the pasuk there uses verbiage of “havaya”, which teaches that each animal is essential!? **A:** It refers to the two Shavuos korbanos, and the Mishna is teaching that the ram of the Shavuos mussaf is not essential to the ram of the Shte Halechem korbon, and visa-versa.
  - **Q:** This explanation means that regarding the parim and the lambs the Mishna means to say that they are not essential within the same korbon, but with regard to the rams the Mishna is talking about different korbanos!? **A:** Yes, the Mishna is teaching separate things.
- A pasuk in Yechezkel says “uviyom hachodesh par ben bakar temimim v'sheishes kvasim va'ayil temimim yihiyu”. The word “par” teaches that although the Torah requires multiple parim to be brought on Rosh Chodesh, if they only have one it is valid. The “sheishes kvasim” teaches that although the Torah requires 7 kvasim, if they only have 6 it is valid. A pasuk says “kasher tasig yado”, which teaches that even if they only have one it is valid. The reason the pasuk says “sheishes” is to teach that they should still get as many as they can (up to 7). The word “yihiyu” teaches that when they do have all the animals, they are each essential to the other.
  - **Q:** A pasuk in Yechezkel says, “barishon b'echad lachodesh tikach par ben bakar tamim v'chiteisa es HaMikdash”. Now, the par of Rosh Chodesh (which seems to be the subject of the pasuk) is an olah, so why is it referred to as a chatas!? **A:** **R' Yochanan** said, this pasuk will have to be explained by Eliyahu. **R' Ashi** said, it refers to “milu'im” korbanos that were brought by Ezra at the inauguration of the Beis Hamikdash, just like the milu'im korbanos that were brought by Moshe at the inauguration of the Mishkan. A Braisa gives these two approaches as well.
  - **Q:** A pasuk in Yechezkel says that neveilos and treifos may not be eaten by the Kohanim. Is this to imply that a Yisrael may eat neveilos and treifos? **A:** **R' Yochanan** said, this pasuk will have to be explained by Eliyahu. **Ravina** said, this is needed to teach that the Kohanim are *also* assur to eat these issurim. We would think that since they eat bird korbanos that are not shechted they may also eat neveilos and treifos.
  - **Q:** A pasuk in Yechezkel says, “v'chein taaseh b'shiva bachodesh mei'ish shogeh umipesi v'chipartem es habayis”. **R' Yochanan** said, this pasuk refers to the par helam davar shel tzibbur. The word “shiva” teaches that as long as 7 shevatim have sinned, even if they are less than a majority of the Yidden, the korbon is brought. “Chodesh” means that the erroneous psak must have been something new – for example that Beis Din said that cheilev is mutar. “Mei'sih shogeh umipesi” teaches that they are only chayuv if the psak was erroneous and the act was done b'shogeg.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** praised **Chanina ben Chizkiya**, because he explained a number of pesukim in Yechezkel that seemed to contradict the Torah. His doing so prevented the Rabanan from having the Sefer hidden away.

### AMAR R' SHIMON IHM HAYU LAHEM PARIM MERUBIN

- A Braisa says, a pasuk says, “v'eifa lapar v'eifa la'ayil yaaseh mincha...”. **R' Shimon** asked, the amount for the mincha of a par and of an ayil are not the same! Rather, this teaches that if they could get many parim or rams but then would not be able to get the nesachim to go along with them, they are better off getting less than the required number and instead bringing them with the proper nesachim.

### MISHNA

- The par, rams, and lambs of the olah and goat of the chatas of the Shavuot Korbos Mussaf are not essential to the Shte Halechem, and visa-versa.
- The Shte Halechem are essential to the lambs of the Korbos Shelamim that accompanies the Shte Halechem, but the lambs are not essential to the Shte Halechem. This is the view of **R' Akiva**. **R' Shimon Ben Nanas** said, this is incorrect. Rather, the lambs are essential to the breads, but the breads are not essential to the rams, for in the Midbar the Yidden would bring the lambs for the shelamim but would not bring the breads. So too, after they came into EY, the breads are not essential to the lambs of the shelamim.
  - **R' Shimon** said, the halacha follows **Ben Nanas**, but not for his reason, because in fact the Yidden did not bring the shelamim of the Shte Halechem until they entered EY. Rather, the reason the bread is not essential to the shelamim is that the lambs are their own “matir”, whereas the breads only have the lambs as their matir and therefore the lambs are essential for the breads.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk of “v'hikravtem ahl halechem” seems to say that the lambs are only brought along with the breads. The pasuk of “shivas kevasim temimim” seems to teach that they are brought even when there are no breads. We must say that “ahl halechem” teaches that the obligation of the lambs only began when the obligation of the Shte Halechem breads began, which was after they entered EY. This is the view of **R' Tarfon**. We would think that the 7 kevasim listed regarding the Shte Halechem are the same as those listed regarding the mussaf, however we find that the number of parim and rams are different. Therefore, it must be that 7 are brought with the Shte Halechem and 7 are brought for the mussaf. The mussaf was offered even in the Midbar, whereas the Shte Halechem and accompanying korbos was only brought once they entered EY.

### HALECHEM ME'AKEIV ES HAKVASIM

- **R' Akiva** based his view on a gezeira shava between one pasuk that says “yihiyu” and another that says “tihiyena”. Just as the subject of this second pasuk is breads, the “yihiyu” must also be referring to the breads and teaches that they are essential. **Ben Nanas** makes a gezeira shava between this pasuk of “yihiyu” and another pasuk of “yihiyu” where the subject is lambs. The gezeira shava teaches that it is the lambs that are essential.
  - **Ben Nanas** doesn't learn a gezeira shava from “tihiyena”, because he says it is not the same word as “yihiyu”. Although **R' Yishmael** has taught that even the words “shiva” and “bi'ah” can be darshened for a gezeira shava, that is only when there are no like words that can be darshened.
  - **R' Akiva** rather learn from “tihiyena”, because he wants to learn something that is a gift to the Kohen from something else that is a gift to the Kohen, rather than from an Olah (which is the other “yihiyu”) which is not a gift to the Kohen.
  - We can also say that they argue in the explanation of the pasuk itself. The pasuk says “kodesh yihiyu LaHashem laKohen”. **R' Akiva** holds that it refers to something that goes to the Kohen – which refers to the breads. **Ben Nanas** says, “LaHashem laKohen” refers to something that goes part to Hashem and part to the Kohen – which is the shelamim.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 17---46-----

- **R' Yochanan** said, all agree that if the Shte Halechem and the lambs of the shelamim became “zakuk” (“attached”) to each other, they become essential to each other (and one could not be brought without the other). What makes them considered to be zakuk to each other? It is the shechita of the lambs.
  - **Ulla** said, they asked in EY whether the tenufa that is done with the breads and the lambs together (before the shechita) create this zika or not.
    - **Q:** Why couldn't they answer based on **R' Yochanan**, from whom we see that it is the shechita that creates the zika, nothing before that!? **A:** The question was regarding **R' Yochanan** – does he mean that it is only the shechita that creates the zika, or does he mean that the shechita definitely creates the zika and he is unsure whether the tenufa would also create a zika. To that question, the Gemara leaves off with a **TEIKU**.
    - **Q: R' Yehuda bar Chanina** said to **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua**, we have learned that **Ben Nanas and R' Akiva** argue whether the breads and lambs are essential to each other and they argue regarding the understanding of the pasuk of “kodesh yihyu LaHashem laKohen”. This pasuk is referring to *after* the tenufa was done, and therefore shows that the tenufa does not create a zika!? **A:** The pasuk is also referring to after the shechita (that is the only time that it is given to the Kohen)! We must say that the pasuk means to refer to before the shechita and speaks of the thing that will eventually be given to the Kohen. In that same way, we can say that it refers to before the tenufa as well.
    - **Q:** How can **R' Yochanan** say that the shechita creates the zika? A Braisa regarding a Korbon Todah discusses cases where some sort of psul happened to one of the loaves of bread (a loaf broke, left the Azarah), and says that if this psul happened after the shechita, but before the zrika, the zrika is then done for the sake of a Shelamim and the meat is eaten as a Shelamim, and he has not fulfilled his obligation to bring a todah (because the korbon has the status of a shelamim) and the bread is passul. Now, if the shechita creates a zika between the korbon and the breads, then if the breads become passul after the shechita the korbon should become passul as well!? **A:** The case of a Todah is different, because the Torah refers to it as a “shelamim”. We learn, that just as a shelamim is offered without breads, so too a todah may sometimes be offered without breads.
    - **R' Yirmiya** said, if you will say that the tenufa makes the zika, then if the breads are lost after the tenufa the lambs are destroyed, and visa-versa. If you say that tenufa does not create a zika, then if the tenufa was done and the breads were then lost, and he brought replacement breads, do these replacement breads need a tenufa as well? If the lambs were lost and replacement lambs were brought they would certainly need a new tenufa. The question is only when there are replacement breads. Also, according to **Ben Nanas**, who holds that the lambs are the main part of the korbon, the replacement breads would definitely not need a new tenufa. The question is according to **R' Akiva**, who holds that the lambs are the main part – would the replacement breads need a new tenufa, or do we say that since the lambs are the matir and they had a tenufa, the new breads do not need a tenufa? **TEIKU**.
- **Abaye** asked **Rava**, why is it that the shelamim lambs make the Shte Halechem kadosh and are essential to them, but the par and rams of the olah do not make the breads kadosh and are not essential to them? **Rava** said, it is because the shelamim and the breads become zakuk to each other with the joint tenufa.
  - **Q:** A todah does not have a joint tenufa for its korbon and breads and still the korbon makes the breads kadosh and is essential to them!? **A:** Rather, the Shte Halechem is like the todah. Just as a todah is a shelamim, and the korbon makes the breads kadosh and is essential to them, so too the shelamim of the Shte Halechem makes the breads kadosh and is essential to them.
    - **Q:** The todah has no other korbanos that are brought along with the breads, but the Shte Halechem does, so why don't we say that the other korbanos also make the breads kadosh!? **A:** Rather, the shelamim of the Shte Halechem is like the shelamim of the nazir. Just like it is the shelamim of the nazir that makes the breads kadosh even though there are other korbanos that

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

are brought (this is learned in a Braisa from a pasuk), so too it is the shelamim of the Shte Halechem that makes the breads kadosh even though there are other korbanos that are brought.

- A Braisa says, if the breads of the Shte Halechem are brought on their own (the accompanying korban was not brought), they should have a tenufa done to them, they should then be left overnight and taken out to be burned.
  - **Q:** If they can be eaten, let them be eaten, and if they must be burned, let them be burned! Why must they first be left overnight!? **A: Rabbah** said, D'Oraisa they can be eaten. The **Rabanan** were goizer that if we allow them to be eaten, then the next year people will forget that when there are lambs the lambs must be shechted before the breads may be eaten and will go ahead and eat the breads before the shechita. Therefore, we leave it overnight so that they become passul even D'Oraisa and then we burn them.
    - **Rabbah** said, I can prove that the breads may be eaten D'Oraisa when they are brought on their own, from a Mishna. The Mishna says, **R' Yehuda** says, **Ben Buchri** testified in Yavneh, if a Kohen gives a machtzis hashekel, he has not done an aveirah. **R' Yochanan ben Zakai** said to him, actually, any Kohen who does *not* give a machtzis hashekel has done an aveirah! He explains, the reason some Kohanim don't give is because they darshen a pasuk incorrectly for their benefit. A pasuk says that a Mincha brought by a Kohen may not be eaten and must be entirely burned. These Kohanim say, since some of the Minachos brought by the tzibbur must be eaten (the Omer, Shte Halechem, Lechem Hapanim), we cannot give money towards them (by giving a machtzis hashekel), because if we do, they will not be allowed to be eaten! Now, what is the case of their concern regarding the Shte Halechem? If it was brought along with the korban, then it is no different than a Todah, and the todah of a Kohen is eaten! Rather, the case is that the breads were brought alone, and we see that even when they are brought alone they are eaten!
      - **Abaye** said this is not a proof. The breads of a the Shte Halechem are different than the breads of a todah, because the breads of the Shte Halechem are referred to in the Torah as a "mincha", whereas the breads of a todah are not.
  - **R' Yosef** said, that even D'Oraisa the breads brought on their own may *not* be eaten. The reason they are not burned immediately is that we don't burn passul kodashim on Yom Tov, so we leave them over until after Yom Tov (the next day) and burn them then.
    - **Q: Abaye** asked, pasul kodashim are not burned, because that is not the mitzvah that is supposed to be done with them (rather, they became passul so we have no choice but to burn them). However, when the breads are brought on their own, the proper mitzvah is to burn them, just like the mitzvah is to burn the par and goat of Yom Kippur – which are burned on Yom Kippur itself, so why would we have to wait until after Yom Tov to burn them!? **A:** Rather, **R' Yosef** said, the reason we wait to burn them is that we are hoping that lambs will become available at some point during the day, at which point we would be able to do a joint tenufa with them, and the breads would become mutar to be eaten.
      - **Q: Abaye** asked, that explains why we delay the burning for as long as the korban could be brought, but once that time has passed (after the afternoon tamid has been offered) the breads should be burned immediately!? Why do we need to wait overnight? **A:** The Braisa actually means that we leave them over until after the time that a korban could be offered.
  - **Rava** said, that D'Oraisa the breads brought alone may be eaten, and we burn them as a gezeira, like **Rabbah** said. However, **Rava** brings a different source. The pasuk calls the Shte Halechem by the term "bikkurim". This teaches, that just as bikkurim are brought on their own, the breads may also be brought on their own. Also, just as the bikkurim are eaten, so too the breads may be eaten.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 17A-----47-----

- A Braisa says, the lambs only make the breads kadosh through their shechita. How so? If they were shechted lishma and the zrika was done lishma the breads become kadosh. If the shechita and the zrika were done not lishma, the breads do not become kadosh. If the shechita was done lishma but the zrika was done not lishma, **Rebbi** says the breads are “kadosh but not kadosh”. **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Shimon** says, the breads are only kadosh if the shechita and the zrika were both done lishma.
  - **Rebbi’s** view that the shechita alone makes the breads kadosh is based on the pasuk of “v’es ha’ayil yaaseh zevach (referring to shechita) shelamim LaHashem ahl sal hamatzos” written regarding the nazir’s shelamim and breads, and we learn from there. **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Shimon** says, the word “yaaseh” teaches that they only become kadosh when *all* the things were done. **Rebbi** says, since the pasuk says “yaaseh zevach” it teaches that the things to be done refer only to the “zevach” – to the shechita. **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Shimon** says, that the word “zevach” teaches like **R’ Yochanan**, who says that all agree that the bread must exist at the time of the shechita.
  - **Q:** What does **Rebbi** mean that the breads are “kadosh but not kadosh”? **A:** **Abaye** said, it means it is kadosh but not completely kadosh. **Rava** said, it means it is kadosh but is not mutar for the Kohanim to eat.
    - **Q:** What is the difference between the two? **A:** The difference would be where the bread is redeemed. According to **Abaye** the money used would become kadosh, and according to **Rava** it would not (this version follows Rashi’s ultimate explanation).
      - **Q:** According to **Rava** we can explain the machlokes as being that **Rebbi** holds the money would not become kadosh and **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Shimon** holds that it does. However, according to **Abaye**, what is the machlokes? **A:** The machlokes would be whether the breads would become passul for leaving the Azarah – according to **Rebbi** they would become passul and according to **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Shimon** they would not.
  - **Q:** **R’ Shmuel bar R’ Yitzchak** asked **R’ Chiya bar Abba**, if the lambs were shechted lishma but the zrika was done not lishma, may the breads be eaten? The Gemara asks, what is the question!? According to **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Shimon** it is the zrika that makes the breads kadosh and according to **Abaye’s and Rava’s** understanding of **Rebbi** the breads may not be eaten!? The Gemara explains, he is asking according to the view of **R’ Akiva** in a Braisa taught by the father of **R’ Yirmiya bar Abba**, where **R’ Akiva** says that if the breads of the Shte Halechem left the Azarah after the shechita but before the zrika, and the zrika was then done with piggul intent, **R’ Akiva** says that the breads become assur as piggul as well. **R’ Sheishes** explained that **R’ Akiva** follows **Rebbi**, but holds that a zrika is effective for something that was taken out of the Azarah, which is something that we find that **R’ Akiva and R’ Eliezer** argue about elsewhere. Based on this, **R’ Shmuel bar R’ Yitzchak** was asking that according to **R’ Akiva**, since the zrika can combine the breads to the lambs in terms of piggul, maybe it can do so even when the zrika was done not lishma as well? Or maybe we say that it only combines l’chumra, not l’kula?
    - **Q:** **R’ Pappa** asked, why must we understand **R’ Akiva** as explained by **R’ Sheishes** that the breads were outside the Azarah at the time of the shechita? Maybe the case is that the breads were brought back in before the shechita and **R’ Akiva** is following the view of **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Shimon**, who holds that the shechita does not make the breads kadosh and they therefore did not become passul when they were taken out of the Azarah? **A:** It must be that **R’ Akiva** is following the view of **Rebbi** that the shechita makes them kadosh, because if it is only the zrika that makes them kadosh, a passul zrika, like a zrika of piggul, could not make them kadosh, as we find that **R’ Gidal in the name of Rav** said that a zrika of piggul cannot make a korbon subject to, or free from, me’ilah.
      - The Gemara says this is not a valid refutation of **R’ Pappa**, because we have learned that this ruling of **R’ Gidal in the name of Rav** was refuted. Therefore, it cannot serve as the basis of explaining the view of **R’ Akiva**.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yirmiya** asked **R' Zeira**, if the lambs were shechted lishma and the breads were then lost, may the zrika then be done not lishma so as to allow the meat to be eaten (it would then become a regular shelamim, not the shelamim of the Shte Halechem, and could therefore be eaten)? **R' Zeira** said, can there be something that is passul if done lishma but would be valid if done not lishma?
  - **Q:** We have the case of a Korbon Pesach that is offered before chatzos, that is passul if done lishma and is valid if done not lishma (it becomes a shelamim)!? **A: R' Zeira** meant, do we ever find something that was fit to be brought lishma, was then rejected from being brought lishma and would be passul if brought lishma, and yet would be valid if brought not lishma?
    - **Q:** We have the case of a Pesach brought after the time for its shechting (which was fit to be brought lishma, and now would be passul if brought lishma, and yet is valid if brought not lishma)!? **A: R' Zeira** meant, do we ever find something that was fit to be brought lishma, was shechted lishma, was then rejected from being brought lishma and would be passul if brought lishma, and yet would be valid if brought not lishma?
      - **Q:** We have learned that a todah that was shechted lishma and was then rejected can have the zrika done for the sake of a shelamim and may then be eaten!? **A:** The case of a todah is different, because the Torah refers to a todah as a shelamim.