



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Menachos, Daf ןג – Daf ןד

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 ןג--48-----

- A Braisa says, if the lambs of the Shte Halechem were shechted for 4 breads instead of 2, he takes two of the loaves and does a tenufa together with the lambs, and the other two are eaten after redemption.
 - The **Rabanan** said to **R' Chisda**, this Braisa does not follow **Rebbi**, because he holds that the breads become kadosh with the shechita. If so, where would one redeem the breads? If they are taken out of the Azarah to be redeemed, they become passul for having left the Azarah! If they are redeemed in the Azarah, he is bringing chullin into the Azarah, which is assur!? **R' Chisda** said the Braisa can follow **Rebbi**, because the redemption can be done inside the Azarah, and since they become chullin on their own it would not be assur for bringing chullin into the Azarah.
 - **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, a Braisa says that when this redemption is done it should be done outside the Azarah!? **A:** This Braisa clearly only follows **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon**, because according to **Rebbi** the breads would become passul if taken outside the Azarah.
 - **Q: R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, the Braisa seems to refute **R' Yochanan** who says that if a todah was shechted for 80 breads (instead of the required 40), none of the breads become kadosh. Now, the Braisa said that when there are too many breads at least some become kadosh!? **A:** We have learned that **R' Zeira** said that all agree that where the person says that 40 out of the 80 should become kadosh, 40 will become kadosh. We can say that the Braisa is talking about such a case, where he said that 2 out of the 4 should become kadosh.
- **R' Chanina Tirasa** taught a Braisa in front of **R' Yochanan** that said, if the Kohen shechted 4 lambs for the two breads, he first takes two of them and does their zrika not lishma, and only then does the zrika of the remaining two lishma. If you don't say to follow this order, then he will end up not being able to eat the two that are not being done for the korbon. **R' Yochanan** said, would we tell someone to do an aveira (doing a zrika not lishma is an aveira) just so that he can gain and be able to eat the other animals? A Mishna says, if the limbs of a chatas became mixed with the limbs of an olah, **R' Eliezer** says they should all be put on the fire on the Mizbe'ach and we view the chatas meat as if it were wood (the limbs of a chatas may not be burned on the Mizbe'ach). The **Chachomim** say we leave them overnight (so that they become nossar) and we then burn them off the Mizbe'ach as nossar. Now, according to the **Chachomim** we should say that he should do the aveira of putting the chatas limbs on the Mizbe'ach so that the owner gain and have his olah put on the Mizbe'ach? Rather, we see that we don't allow one to do so!
 - The Gemara says, this case is different. We would tell someone to do an aveira with a chatas in order to gain for the chatas. However, we would not tell someone to do an aveira with a chatas in order to gain for an olah.
 - **Q:** Is that correct, that for the same thing we would tell someone to do the aveira? A Braisa says that if the korbon of Shavuot was erroneously shechted too early or too late, and it was shechted on a Shabbos, its blood should not be offered. However, if one did offer the blood then, it accomplishes that the eimurim should be offered that night (and the korbon could then be eaten). Now, why don't we say to do the aveira of doing the zrika on Shabbos so that we gain, in that the eimurim are offered that evening and the korbon is eaten!? **A:** We would tell someone to do an aveira on Shabbos in order to gain for Shabbos. However, we would not tell someone to do an aveira on Shabbos in order to gain for after Shabbos.
 - **Q:** Do we not tell someone to do an aveira in order to gain for something else? A Mishna says, **R' Yehoshua** argues with **R' Eliezer** and says, if tahor terumah wine is spilling into tamei chullin wine, and there is no way to save even a revi'is of the terumah wine from becoming tamei (he has no tahor keilim), one may try and catch the terumah in tamei keilim to prevent it from

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

mixing with the chullin and making the chullin unusable as well. We see that we tell him to do an aveira (make the terumah tamei) to gain by saving the chullin!? **A:** That case is different since the terumah will anyway become tamei if left alone (it will flow into the tamei chullin wine).

- **R' Yitzchak** taught a Braisa that said, if the Shavuot lambs are shechted not lishma they are passul, and should therefore be left overnight and taken out to be burned. **R' Nachman** said to **R' Yitzchak**, you compare the obligatory shelamim to a chatas, and therefore say that it is passul if offered not lishma. The **Tanna Divei Levi** taught a Braisa that compares the obligatory shelamim to a donated shelamim and therefore holds that the lambs would be valid if shechted not lishma.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that an asham that is brought when it is the wrong age would be passul and would be left overnight and taken out to be burned, but an obligatory olah that was brought when it was the wrong age would be valid. The Braisa says that the general rule is, that anything that is valid for a donated olah would be valid for an obligatory olah. This contradicts **R' Yitzchak**!? **A:** This Braisa is the Tanna of the Braisa taught by the yeshiva of **Levi**.
 - **Q: Levi** taught a Braisa that says, if the asham of a nazir or of a metzora was shechted not lishma they are valid, but don't fulfil the owner's obligation. If they were shechted while premature because of the owner (before the owner should have brought them in his process), or if they were not the proper age, they are passul. Now, according to **R' Nachman's** explanation of **Levi** earlier, we should say that he should compare the asham to a shelamim and say that it is valid even if brought at the wrong age!? **A:** He compares one type of shelamim to another, but would not compare an asham to a shelamim.
 - **Q:** He should then compare one type of asham to another – the asham of a nazir and metzora from the asham gezeilos and asham me'ilos – and say that just like the asham gezeilos and asham me'ilos are to be brought in their second year, if the asham of a nazir and metzora are brought in their second year it should be valid, and just as the asham of a nazir and metzora are valid when brought in their first year, the asham gezeilos and asham me'ilos are also valid when brought in their first year, with the result that all ashamos are valid whether brought in their first or second year!? **A: R' Simi bar Ashi** said, we learn something that is done improperly from something that is done improperly, and don't learn something that is done improperly from something that is done properly.
 - **Q:** Is that so? A Braisa says that we learn that if part of a korbon was taken out of the Azarah and then brought back in and put on the Mizbe'ach, it is not taken down. This is learned from the fact that a korbon on a bamah is valid even though it is out of the Azarah. We see that we learn something that is done improperly from something that is done properly!? **A:** The Tanna of this Braisa actually learns this from the pasuk of "zos Toras ha'olah", and not from the comparison to the korbon of a bamah.

-----Daf 49-----

- **Rabbah bar bar Chana** taught a Braisa in front of **Rav** that said, if the Shavuot lambs were shechted for the sake of rams (which are older sheep than lambs), it is valid but has not fulfilled the obligation of the tzibbur to bring the shelamim. **Rav** said, they have definitely fulfilled their obligation.
 - **R' Chisda** said, **Rav's** ruling makes sense where the one who shechted thought the lambs were rams (he was mistaken) and then shechted them for the sake of lambs (according to his mistake he was shechting it not lishma, although in reality they were lambs that were being shechted for the sake of lambs). However, if he thought that the lambs were rams and intended to shecht them as rams (so that the intent was actually not lishma), it would make sense to say that the tzibbur has not fulfilled its obligation. This is because an "uprooting in error" (the shelo lishma was done based on an error) is considered to be an uprooting (i.e. it is considered to be a true shelo lishma) and therefore wouldn't fulfil the tzibbur's obligation. **Rabbah** said that an "uprooting in error" is not considered to be an uprooting (it is not considered to be shelo lishma), and therefore, even in that case **Rav** meant to say that the tzibbur would have fulfilled its obligation.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Rabbah** said, we can ask on our teaching based on a Mishna which says that if a Kohen makes something piggul (with his intent), if he did so b'meizid he is chayuv to pay the owner for the korbon, if it was b'shogeg he is patur. A Braisa explained that in either case the intent causes the korbon to be passul as piggul. Now, what is the case of shogeg? If he knew that the korbon was, for example, a chatas and he intended that it would be eaten like a shelamim (beyond the time of a chatas) then that would be a case of meizid! Rather, it must be that he thought it was a shelamim and he therefore intended that it be eaten like a shelamim, and still it becomes piggul. We see that an “uprooting in error” is considered to be an uprooting!? **A: Abaye** said, the case may be that he knew it was a chatas and intended that it be eaten as a shelamim, and the case of shogeg is that he thought it is mutar to have such an intent.
- **Q: R' Zeira** asked, a Braisa says, **R' Shimon** says, all menachos whose kemitza was done not lishma are valid and even fulfill the owner's obligation. This is because menachos are different than animal korbanos in that each type of mincha is *noticeably* different than the other (a dry mincha is noticeably different than one with a lot of oil, a machavas is noticeably different than a marcheshes, etc.) and therefore the noticeable difference counters and refutes the intent of shelo lishma. However, with animal korbanos all the avodos are the same – they have the same shechita, kabbalah, and zrika. Now, what is the case? If he knew it was a machavas and he intended the kemitza for the sake of a marcheshes, who cares if it is noticeably different? He has purposely uprooted the machavas!? Rather, the case must be where he *thinks* it is a marcheshes and does the kemitza for a marcheshes, in which case his uprooting intent was done in error. Now, it is only by a mincha that it remains valid, because the noticeable difference refutes his intent. This suggests that in other cases an “uprooting in error” would be an uprooting!? **A: Abaye** said, the case is that he knew it was a machavas and still intended for a marcheshes. We must follow **Rabbah's** explanation of **R' Shimon**, and **Rabbah** says that **R' Shimon** holds that shelo lishma of a mincha only makes it passul when it is not a recognizably false intent. However, when it is obviously false, it does not become passul.

MISHNA

- The temidim are not essential to the mussafim and the mussafim are not essential to the temidim, and the mussafim are not essential to each other.
- If the morning Tamid was not brought in the morning, the afternoon Tamid may still be brought in the afternoon. **R' Shimon** said, that is only if they didn't bring the morning Tamid because of an oneis or a shogeg. However, if they didn't bring it because of a meizid, they may not bring the afternoon Tamid that day either.
 - If the morning ketores was not brought in the morning, they may still bring the afternoon ketores. **R' Shimon** said, in that case they would bring the full maneh of ketores (typically half that is brought in the morning and half in the afternoon) in the afternoon. For the Golden Mizbe'ach is only inaugurated with ketores in the afternoon.
 - The Mizbach Ha'Olah (the outside Mizbe'ach) is only inaugurated with the morning Tamid. The Shulchan is only inaugurated with the Lechem Hapanim on Shabbos. The Menorah is only inaugurated with the 7 neiros lit in the afternoon.

GEMARA

- **Q: R' Chiya bar Avin** asked **R' Chisda**, if the tzibbur does not have enough animals for the temidim and the mussafim, which takes precedence? [The Gemara asks, what is the case at question? If it is regarding the tamid for that day and the mussaf for that day it should be obvious that the tamid takes precedence, because it is both tadir and mekudash!? Rather, the question is when the animal could either be saved for the tamid of the following day or for the mussaf of today. The question is, do we say that the tamid takes precedence because it is tadir, or do we say that the mussaf takes precedence because it is mekudash (since it is brought on a Yom Tov and is brought on the day in question)?] **A: R' Chisda** said, we can answer from our Mishna, which said that the temidim are not essential to the mussafim and the mussafim are not essential to the temidim, and the mussafim

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

are not essential to each other. What is the Mishna referring to? It can't be where there are enough animals and the question is which korbon is to be offered first, because a Braisa darshens a pasuk to teach that the Tamid must be the first korbon of the day! Rather, it is obvious that the Mishna is referring to where there are not enough animals for both korbanos. Now, the case can't be where the question is to use it for the tamid of today or the mussaf of today, because in that case it would be clear that we would use it for the tamid, since it is both tadir and mekudash! Rather, the question must be whether to use the animal for the tamid of tomorrow or the mussaf of today, and the Mishna says that neither is essential to the other, which means that they are of equal status and neither takes precedence!

- **Abaye** said, the Mishna is not a valid proof. The Mishna may be dealing with the question of which korbon is offered first when there are sufficient animals for both korbanos. Although the Braisa learns from a pasuk that nothing may be offered before the Tamid, that is the ideal case, but if the mussaf were to be brought first, it would be valid.
- **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from a Mishna which says that we may never have less than 6 lambs in the "Ishkas hatela'im" that have been fully checked, enough for the korbanos of Shabbos and the 2 days of Rosh Hashanah (when they fall out 3 days in a row). Now, what is the case? If the case is that there are enough animals for all the temidim (2 per day) and the mussafim needed, then there would need to be many more than 6 animals! Rather, the case is where there are only 6 animals, and we see that they are to be saved for the temidim of the next day rather than to be used for the mussaf of today! **A:** The Mishna may be referring to where there are sufficient animals for both. The Mishna is referring to having 6 animals that have each been checked for 4 days, which is the view of **Ben Bag Bag** in a Braisa, where he says that the Tamid must have been checked for a mum for 4 days before being offered.
 - **Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, for these 3 days there should be 7 lambs that are needed, because one more is needed for the morning after the Yom Tov, which is before there will be a chance to buy additional checked animals from the market!? **R' Ashi** said, according to your reasoning, there should need to be 8, because one is needed for the Friday afternoon before the 3 days as well! **Ravina** said, that is not an issue, because the Mishna is giving the number that is needed after the offering of the Friday afternoon tamid! The question still remains as to why the Mishna doesn't say that 7 are needed. The Gemara answers that the Mishna is actually referring to all times – there should always be at least 6 checked lambs ready to be offered. It does not refer to a case of Shabbos followed by Rosh Hashanah. That was just used as a remembering tool of a span where 6 temidim would be brought.

-----Daf 50-----

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.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **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 korbon 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

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

brings another half issaron and offers it. The pasuk of “umachtzisah 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 “umachtzisah 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 nossar 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 nossar. 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 nossar before it is burned. **A: 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 nossar 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.

-----Daf X]---51-----

- 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?

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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*.

-----Daf 52-----

- A *Braisa* says, the funds used to purchase a *par helmet* *davar shel tzibbur* and the goat brought for the *tzibbur's* *aveira of avodah zara*: **R' Yehuda** says is raised with a new collection that is done when this obligation arises, and **R' Shimon** says it is taken from the communal funds of the *terumas halishka*.
 - **Q:** Another *Braisa* has these *shitos* reversed!? **A:** We must follow the *Braisa* that was taught later (that is the one presumed to be more correct). The **Rabanan** said in front of **R' Ashi** that it would seem that the first *Braisa* is the later one. We have said earlier that **R' Shimon** is concerned for negligence when it comes to getting people to pay for something. Therefore, here too it would make sense that he would not advise to make a new collection and risk that negligence. Rather, he would suggest that we take money from the *terumas halishka*. **R' Ashi** said, this is not a reason to say that the first *Braisa* is the later one. It may be that the second *Braisa* is the later one. It may be that **R' Shimon** is only concerned for negligence when the people being asked to pay do not get a *kapparah* from that *korbon*. In this case they are, so he would not be concerned for negligence and may say that a new collection should be made.
 - **Q:** What is the final decision regarding this? **A: Rabbah Zuti** said to **R' Ashi**, a *Braisa* clearly says that **R' Shimon** darshens a *pasuk* to teach that the *par helmet davar* and the goat brought for the *tzibbur's* *aveira of avoda zara* are both paid for from the funds in the *terumas halishka*.

USHLEIMA HUYS KREIVA...

- **Q: R' Chiya bar Abba** said, **R' Yochanan** asked, does the *Mishna* mean that in this case a full issaron was brought in the morning and another full issaron in the afternoon, or does it mean that a full issaron was brought in the morning and nothing was brought in the afternoon? **A: Rava** said, a *Mishna* lists the number and function of the *Kohanim* involved in the *tamid* every day and lists a *Kohen* who would bring up the chavitin of the *Kohen Gadol*. Now, since the *Mishna* makes no exception to this rule, it must mean that the chavitin is brought every morning and every afternoon without exception. This would mean that when there is no *Kohen Gadol*, a full issaron is brought in the morning and a full issaron is brought in the afternoon.
 - When this proof was said to **R' Yirmiya** he strongly disagreed. He said that the *Mishna* also lists *Kohanim* to carry the flour and wine for the mincha that accompanies the *tamid*. Now, we learn that the *halacha* is that if the mincha is not available, it may even be brought the following day. In that case those *Kohanim* would not be needed, and yet the *Mishna* lists them as if there is no exception! The same thing can be said regarding the chavitin. Clearly, the *Mishna* means to list the normal procedure. It may be that regarding the chavitin as well, the *Mishna* is only listing the normal procedure, but if there is no *Kohen Gadol*, it may be that no chavitin was brought in the afternoon. When this was repeated to **Rava**,

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

he said, even if it cannot be learned from the Mishna, it can be learned from the pasuk of “soles mincha tamid”, which teaches that the chavitin is like the mincha of the tamid – meaning that it is brought every morning and afternoon, without exception.

- **Q:** How do we come out regarding this machlokes? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, a Braisa says that a full issaron was offered in the morning and then again in the afternoon.
- **R' Yochanan** said, **Abba Yosef ben Dustai and the Rabanan** argue regarding the levonah of the chavitin – **Abba Yosef** says that the Kohen Gadol brings two kematzim of levonah with the chavitin, one to be offered in the morning and one for the afternoon, and the **Rabanan** say that he brings only one kometz, half is offered in the morning and half in the afternoon.
 - The machlokes is that **Abba Yosef** holds that we never find that a half of kometz is offered, whereas the **Rabanan** hold that we never find one issaron requiring more than one kometz of levonah to be brought with it.
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** asked, if a Kohen Gadol died and no replacement was yet appointed (and a full issaron is brought as the chavitin during this time), would the **Rabanan** say that the amount of levonah should be doubled? Do we say that just as the amount of flour is doubled to a full issaron, the amount of levonah is also doubled, or do we say that the Torah teaches that the flour is doubled, but we are not taught regarding the levonah so it is not doubled? Also, what about the amount of oil according to **Abba Yosef and the Rabanan** (do we double the oil since the flour is doubled)? **A: Rava** said, a Mishna says there are 5 examples of a kometz. Now, if according to the **Rabanan** there is a full kometz that is brought with each chavitin, there are actually 7 examples!
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof, because it may be that the Mishna doesn't include the example for a case that *may* happen (i.e. the Kohen Gadol dies and no replacement is appointed).
 - **R' Pappa** repeated this and **R' Yosef bar Shmaya** asked, the Mishna lists the example of a kometz offered outside the Azarah, which is also not a normal case and yet the Mishna included it!?
 - **Q:** How do we come out on this issue? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, a Braisa says, if a Kohen Gadol died and no replacement is appointed, they bring a full issaron for a chavitin in the morning and a full issaron in the afternoon and he separates two kematzim of levonah for it, one offered in the morning and one in the afternoon, and he separates 3 lugin of oil, one and a half for the morning and one and a half for the afternoon. Now, this can't be following the **Rabanan**, because why would the levonah be doubled but the oil not be doubled? Rather, it must be the view of **Abba Yosef** who says that the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol always needs two kematzim of levonah, and therefore, in this case, just as the levonah is not doubled the oil is also not doubled. Since the oil is not doubled according to **Abba Yosef** (because the Torah doesn't say it should be doubled), we can say that according to the **Rabanan** the levonah will also not be doubled.
 - **R' Yochanan** said, the halacha follows **Abba Yosef ben Dustai**.
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** has said that we follow an anonymous Mishna, and the anonymous Mishna says that there are only 5 examples of kematzim (and does not include a kometz for the chavitin)!? **A:** It is a machlokes Amora'im as to how **R' Yochanan** paskened.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HATECHEILES!!!

-----Daf 53-----

PEREK KOL HAMENACHOS BA'OS MATZAH -- PEREK CHAMISHI

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

MISHNA

- All menachos are brought as matzah, except for the chametz breads of a Todah and for the Shte Halechem, which are made of chametz.
 - **R' Meir** says, we take the se'or (dough that ferments and can then be used to make other dough become chametz) from these menachos (the Todah or the Shte Halechem) themselves and allow them to become chametz. **R' Yehuda** says that would not be ideal, because the dough would not become fully chametz in that process (because the se'or would not have a chance to fully ferment). Rather, he brings se'or from elsewhere (where it had a chance to fully ferment) and puts it into the issaron measuring keili and fills the rest of the measure with flour for the korbon. **R' Meir** said, using that process would lead to a korbon that has either too much or too little flour (if the se'or is very dense, it will lead to more than an issaron of total flour, and if it is less dense it will lead to too little flour).

GEMARA

- **R' Preida** asked **R' Ami**, from where do we learn that all menachos must be brought as matzah? **R' Ami** said, what is the question? Regarding some menachos is it explicitly written in the pasuk, and regarding the other menachos we learn it from the pasuk of “zos Toras hamincha”, which refers to *all* menachos, and the pasuk later says “matzos tei'acheil”. So why do you ask what the source is? **R' Preida** said, I understand that it is a mitzvah to bring it as matzah, but I am asking how we know that if it is not brought as matzah it is passul even b'dieved. **R' Ami** said, that is also written in the pasuk of “lo sei'afeh chametz”, which teaches that a mincha may not be brought as chametz, which must mean that it is brought as matzah.
 - **Q: R' Chisda** asked, maybe “lo sei'afeh chametz” teaches that it may not be brought as full chametz, but may be brought in a state that is in between matzah and chametz (“sey'ur”), but not that it must be brought as matzah!?
 - **Q:** There is a machlokes as to what stage in the process the dough is considered to be sey'ur. According to **R' Meir** it is when the top becomes white and according to **R' Yehuda** it is when the dough begins to have cracks. To which sey'ur is **R' Chisda** referring? It can't be the sey'ur of **R' Meir** according to **R' Yehuda**, because according to him that is fully matzah. It can't be the sey'ur of **R' Yehuda** according to **R' Meir**, because according to him that is fully chametz. It can't be the sey'ur of **R' Meir** according to **R' Meir**, because he holds that one gets malkus for eating that on Pesach, which means it is considered to be chametz! **A:** Rather, he refers to the sey'ur of **R' Yehuda** according to **R' Yehuda**.
 - **Q: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** asked, maybe “lo sei'afeh chametz” teaches that it may not be brought as chametz, but may be brought when boiling water was poured over the flour?
 - **Q:** That would be the process of “revicha”, which is required for certain types of menachos. If we are discussing such a mincha, the pasuk says that this must be done. If we are not discussing such a mincha, there is no such requirement! **A:** We would think that when the Torah says it must be done there is a mitzvah to do so, but when it doesn't say so specifically, we have a choice to bring it like that or as matzah.
 - **Q: Ravina** asked, maybe “lo sei'afeh chametz” teaches that a person is oiver a lav for allowing it to become chametz, but not that it becomes passul?
 - **Q:** Now that **R' Ami** has been refuted (from these 3 questions), how do we know that matzah is an essential requirement? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk says “matzah tihiyeh”, which makes it essential.
- **R' Preida** asked **R' Ami**, how do we know that menachos are kneaded using lukewarm water and must be guarded from becoming chametz? Do we learn this from Pesach where the pasuk says “ushmartem es hamatzos”? **R' Ami** said, the pasuk regarding menachos says “matzah tihiyeh”, which can be understood as if it says “hachayeha” – keep it as is (keep it from becoming chametz).
 - **Q:** This pasuk was already used to make the matzah requirement essential! **A:** The pasuk could have said “matzah hee” and instead says “matzah tihiyeh”, which allows for both drashos.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- It once happened that **R' Ezra** the grandson of **R' Avtulas** came to **R' Preida**. At that time **R' Preida** darshened a pasuk to mean that the Yidden asked Hashem to reward them for making Hashem known in the world. Hashem said, I will reward Avrohom, Yitzchak, and Yaakov, who were the first to make Me known in the world.
 - **R' Ezra** then said, “let the mighty come and punish on behalf of the mighty from the mighty in the mighty”. He explained this to mean, let Hashem (who is referred to as Mighty in the pasuk) and punish on behalf of the Yidden (who are also referred to as mighty) from the Egyptians (who are also so referred) in the water of the sea (also referred to as mighty).
 - **R' Ezra** then said another such statement – “let a beloved the son of a beloved come and build a beloved for a beloved in the territory of a beloved, and the beloved will receive a kapparah in it”. He explained this to mean, let Shlomo (referred to in a pasuk as a beloved, and the same is with all these references) the descendent of Avrohom come and build the Beis Hamikdash for Hashem in the territory of Binyamin so that the Yidden can receive a kapparah in it.
 - **R' Ezra** then said, “let good come and receive good from good for those who are good”. He explained this to mean (again based on pesukim), let Moshe come and get the Torah from Hashem for the Yidden.
 - **R' Ezra** then said, “let this come and receive this from this for this nation”. He explained this to mean (again based on pesukim), let Moshe come and get the Torah from Hashem for the Yidden.
- **R' Yitzchak** said (based on drashos of pesukim), when the Beis Hamikdash was destroyed, Hashem found Avrohom standing in the Beis Hamikdash and asked him why he was there. Avrohom said, “I came because of my children”. Hashem said, “They have sinned and have been sent to galus”. Avrohom said, “Maybe they sinned b’shogeg?” Hashem said, “It was b’meizid”. Avrohom asked, “Maybe it was a minority who sinned”. Hashem said, “It was the majority”. Avrohom said, “You should remember the zechus of the bris milah”. Hashem said, “They have removed the bris milah from themselves”. Avrohom said, “Maybe if you give them time they will do teshuva”. Hashem said, “I gave them time and they did more aveiros”. Avrohom then put his hands on his head and cried. He asked, “Maybe there is no remedy for them?” A Bas Kol spoke and compared the Yidden to an olive tree, which taught that just as an olive tree’s fruit comes out long after it is planted, the Yidden too will eventually merit Moshiach in the future.
 - **R' Chinina bar Pappa** darshened a pasuk to mean that the words of the meraglim caused the Yidden to be punished severely. They spoke as if Hashem would not be able to conquer the inhabitants of EY. **R' Chiya b'R' Chinina** darshened this pasuk to mean that Hashem told Avrohom, “I have heard your voice and will have mercy on the Yidden by decreasing the severity of the galus”.
 - **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, the Yidden are compared to an olive tree, because just as the leaves of the olive tree never fall off the tree in any season, so too the Yidden are never batel – not in Olam Hazeh or Olam Habbah.
 - **R' Yochanan** said, the Yidden are compared to an olive tree, because just as the oil is only released by crushing the olive, so too the Yidden only do teshuva through suffering.

R' MEIR OMER HASE'OR BODEH LAHEN...

- **Q:** What is meant that the micnha will have too much or too little flour? **A:** **R' Chisda** said, if the se'or is thick there will be more flour than the issaron and if it is thin, there will be less.
 - **Q:** After all is said and done, he is measuring in an issaron keili, so it will be exactly an issaron!? **A:** **Rabbah and R' Yosef** explained, we measure based on the amount of flour before water is added. Therefore, the different amounts of water can distort the measurement of the flour.
 - **Q:** Why can't they first measure the flour and then take some of it and make it into se'or and put it back in with the rest of the flour? **A:** That is not allowed, as a gezeira that it may lead to measuring an issaron and then bringing se'or from elsewhere and adding it to the flour, thereby making it more than an issaron of flour.

-----Daf 71--54-----

- A Braisa says, one may not make the Tamid or Shte Halechem chametz by putting in apples. In the name of **R' Chanina ben Gamliel** they said that this may be done.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **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**

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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.