



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Menachos, Daf לט – Daf טז

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

-----Daf לט---83-----

- **Q:** How does **R' Akiva** learn that a Korbon Pesach must be brought from chullin? **A:** He learns it from a hekesh on a pasuk that he learns differently than **Shmuel in the name of R' Eliezer**, as will be shown below.
 - **Shmuel in the name of R' Eliezer** says that the pasuk of “zos hatorah la'olah lamincha v'lachatas v'la'asham v'lamilu'im ulizevach hashelamim” teaches that all korbanos are compared to each of these for a certain aspect:
 - The comparison to olah teaches that all korbanos must be shechted using a metal knife – a kli shareis – like an olah. We learn this for olah from Avrohom shechting the ram by the Akeidah.
 - The comparison to mincha teaches that just as a mincha may only be eaten by male Kohanim, so too there are other korbanos that may only be eaten by male Kohanim. Although the fact that a chatas and ashram may be so eaten is written explicitly in a pasuk, and a shelamim of a tzibbur is learned from a drasha in another pasuk, it is actually a machlokes Tanna'im whether we learn this from the hekesh or from these other pesukim.
 - The comparison to chatas teaches that just as chatas meat that touches other meat makes the other meat like it when there is absorbed flavor, the same is for the meat of the other korbanos that touch other meat.
 - The comparison to ashram teaches that just as the fetus and amniotic sac of an ashram have no kedusha, the same is for those of other korbanos.
 - The comparison to milu'im teaches that just as for a milu'im the leftovers are burned and living animals are not considered to be leftover of a milu'im, the same is for the other korbanos.
 - The comparison to shelamim teaches that just as a shelamim can become piggul themselves and make the other things brought along with them into piggul, the same is true for other korbanos as well.
 - **R' Akiva** says that different things are learned from each of the korbanos:
 - From a mincha we learn that just as something that absorbs from a mincha becomes kadosh like the mincha from that absorption, the same is true for all korbanos.
 - We said earlier that this is learned from chatas as well. The Gemara explains that we need to learn this from mincha and from chatas. If we would only learn it from mincha we would say that that is so for a mincha, because it is soft and absorbs more strongly. If we would only say this regarding chatas we would say that the fats of a chatas make it to be absorbed deeply. That is why both are needed.
 - From a chatas we learn that just as a chatas may only be brought from chullin, and may only be brought during the day, and its Avodah must be done with the Kohen's right hand, so too all other obligatory korbanos must be brought from chullin, during the day, and with the Kohen's right hand.
 - **Q:** How do we know that a chatas must be brought from chullin? **A:** **R' Chisda** said, the pasuk says “v'hikriv Aharon es par hachatas asher lo”, which teaches that it must come from his personal money, and may not be brought from maaser.
 - **Q:** The halacha that korbanos must be offered during the day is learned from the pasuk of “b'yom tzavoso”, not from the hekesh!? **A:** It is in fact not learned from the hekesh, but the Braisa mentions it along with the other things learned from the hekesh, since theoretically it could have been learned from the hekesh.
 - **Q:** The halacha that korbanos must be offered with the Kohen's right hand is learned from **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of Reis Lakish**, who says that whenever the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

pasuk says “etzbah” or “kehunah” it refers to the right hand!? **A:** It is in fact not learned from the hekesh, but the Braisa mentions it along with the other things learned from the hekesh, since theoretically it could have been learned from the hekesh. We can also say that the Braisa holds like **R’ Shimon**, who says that from “kehuna” alone this could not be learned, and therefore we would not know this for the other korbanos.

- From an asham we learn that just as the bones of an asham are mutar, so too the bones of all other korbanos are mutar.
- **Q:** What does **R’ Akiva** darshen with the pasuk of “v’zavachta Pesach”? **A:** He uses it for the drasha of **R’ Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha**, which says that this pasuk teaches that an animal designated as a Pesach which was not ultimately brought as a Pesach gets the status of a Shelamim.
 - **Q:** The halacha that a Pesach that is not needed as a Pesach is brought as a shelamim is learned from a drasha of the father of **Shmuel**, who said, the pasuk says “v’ihm min hatzon korbano l’zevach shelamim”, which teaches that something that is brought from tzon (i.e. a Pesach) is to be brought as a shelamim!? In fact, this halacha is also taught in a Braisa which says that the words of “ihm kesev...ihm eiz” teach something else, and are therefore not extra. The word “kesev” teaches that if a sheep is brought, its tail is offered on the Mizbe’ach; “ihm kesev” teaches that a Pesach that has passed its first year or any shelamim that is brought because of a Pesach needs smicha, nesachim, and tenufa, like any other shelamim; “ihm eiz” teaches that if a goat is brought, its tail is not offered on the Mizbe’ach. Why do we need 3 pesukim to teach the same thing!? **A:** One is needed to teach a case where the time for shechting a Pesach has passed and the animal’s first year has passed (in which case it is no longer fit to be used as a Pesach), a second pasuk is needed to teach a case where the time for shechting has passed but its first year has not passed (even though it is still fit to be offered on Pesach Sheini), and the third pasuk is needed for a case where the time for shechting has not passed and its first year has not passed, but it was shechted as a shelamim (even though it is still fit to be used as a regular Korbon Pesach). In all these cases the korbon is treated as a shelamim.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HATODAH HUYSA BA’AH!!!

PEREK KOL KORBANOS HATZIBBUR -- PEREK TISHI’I

MISHNA

- The grains for all korbanos of the tzibbur and of individuals may come from EY or chutz laaretz, and may come from the new crop or the old crop, except for the Omer and the Shte Halechem, which may only come from the new crop and from EY.
- All of them must come from the best flour. Where does the best flour come from? Machnis and Zitcha have the best soles flour. Second to them is Aforayim in the valley. All lands are valid to have the flour come from them, but they would bring it from these places because of their high quality.

GEMARA

- Our Mishna does not follow the Tanna of a Braisa which says that if the Omer or the Shte Halechem is brought from the old crop, it is valid, but it lacks the mitzvah of bringing it from the new crop.
 - The Omer is valid if brought from the old crop based on the pasuk of “takriv eis minchas bikurecha”, where the word “takriv” teaches that it should even be brought if it is from the old crop. The Shte Halechem is valid if brought from the old crop based on the pasuk of “mimoshvoseychem tavi’u”, where “mimoshvoseychem” teaches that it must be brought from EY and “tavi’u” teaches that it can even be brought from the old crop.
 - **Q:** The word “tavi’u” was earlier used for a different drasha!? **A:** The pasuk could have said “tavi” and instead says “tavi’u”, which allows for both drashos.
 - **Q:** The pasuk regarding each of these says “reishis”, which suggests that it *must* come from the new crop!? **A:** That is for the mitzvah, but b’dieved it would be valid even from the old crop.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The pasuk regarding the Shte Halechem says “chadasha”, which suggests that it *must* come from the new crop!? **A:** That is for the drasha of **R’ Nosson and R’ Akiva** in a Braisa, where they say that it teaches that it should be the first mincha brought from the new crop. However, it is still valid if brought from the old crop.
- The Gemara says, the Tanna’im only disagree whether these must be brought from the new crop. However, all would agree that they must be brought from grain of EY.
 - This does not follow **R’ Yose the son of R’ Yehuda** of a Braisa, who says that the Omer may be brought from grain of chutz laaretz.

-----Daf 7D---84-----

- A Mishna says, the watchmen of the after-growths that grow during shmitta (who make sure that there will be barley available for the Omer) are paid with hekdesch funds. **Rami bar Chama** asked **R’ Chisda**, a Braisa learns from a pasuk that shmitta produce may only be eaten, not burned. If so, how can shmitta produce be used for the Omer when the kemitza of the Omer will be burned!? **R’ Chisda** said, the Torah says that the Omer must be brought in all generations (“lidoroseychem”), so how can you suggest that it should not be brought during shmitta? **Rami** said, I didn’t say they shouldn’t bring the Omer, I am asking that they should instead use barley from the previous year’s crop! **R’ Chisda** said, the pasuk says “karmel” (fresh kernels) so we can’t use the previous year’s barley. **Rami** said, we can fulfil this by using barley that was harvested when they were fresh kernels! **R’ Chisda** said, the pasuk says “karmel takriv”, which teaches that they must be fresh when they are offered, which means that the new crop must be used.
 - **R’ Yochanan** said, that the source that one must use the new crop is the pasuk of “karmel takriv”. **R’ Elazar** said, it is the pasuk of “reishis ketzirchem”.
 - **Q: Rabbah** asked, a Braisa says, **R’ Akiva** says it must be that the Omer is brought from barley, because the pasuk refers to the Shte Halechem as being the “first offering”, and if the Omer is brought from wheat, the Shte Halechem (which is brought from wheat) would not be the first wheat offering! We see that the Shte Halechem must be brought from the new crop and similarly the Omer would have to be brought from the new crop, because a similar word is used to describe it in the pasuk. Now this reason corresponds with **R’ Elazar’s** reason and is different than **R’ Yochanan’s** reason!? This is a **TEYUFTA** of **R’ Yochanan**.
- A Mishna says that bikkurim may only be brought from the “shivas haminim”, and they may not be brought from dates of the mountains or from the produce of the valleys (because they are of inferior quality). **Ulla** said, if one brought bikkurim from other than the shivas haminim or of these inferior dates and produce, they do not even become kadosh.
 - **Q: Rabbah** repeated this ruling of **Ulla**. **R’ Acha bar Abba** asked, a Braisa gives the sources for the halacha that bikkurim may not be brought before the Shte Halechem is offered and even brings a source that the Shte Halechem must be offered before bikkurim that are grown in atypical places – such as on a roof, in a ruin, in a flowerpot, or on a boat. We see that produce grown in these places would have the status of bikkurim, and it would therefore seem to reason that the dates of the mountains and the crops of the valleys would have the status of bikkurim as well!? **A:** That part of the Braisa is referring to grains that grow in these places and means to say that they should not be used for a mincha before the Shte Halechem are brought. However, bikkurim could not be brought from shivas haminim that grew in these places.
 - **Q: R’ Ada bar Ahava** asked, the Braisa there quotes the pasuk that ends off with “kol tahir bibeischa yochalenu”, which means that anyone in the Kohen’s household may eat them. This can’t be referring to a mincha (as previously suggested), because only the male Kohanim may eat a mincha!? **A: R’ Mesharshiya** said, although the beginning of that pasuk refers to a mincha, the end of the pasuk refers to bikkurim, which may even be eaten by the women in the Kohen’s household. **A2: R’ Ashi** said, that the entire pasuk refers to menachos, but the end of the pasuk refers to the Todah breads (a type of mincha), which may be eaten by women as well.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The ruling of **Ulla** is actually the subject of a machlokes: **R' Yochanan** says that if one brought bikkurim from the inferior produce it does not become kadosh and **Reish Lakish** says it does become Kadosh, because it is like a lean animal offered as a korban.
 - **Q: Reish Lakish** explained his reason, but what is **R' Yochanan's** reason? **A: R' Elazar** said, I saw **R' Yochanan** in a dream last night, so I know that I will say a good thing – the pasuk says “*meireishis*” (“*from the first*”) but not all the first, and “*mei'artzecha*” (“*from your land*”) but not all places in your land.
 - **Reish Lakish** uses the “*mei'artzecha*” to create a gezeira shava on “*eret*” that teaches that bikkurim is only brought from the shivas haminim. **R' Yochanan** also uses that gezeira shava, but says that the “*mei*” can be used for the other drashah. **Reish Lakish** does not darshen the “*mei*”.
 - **Q: One Braisa** says that if bikkurim are brought from produce that grew on a roof, in a ruin, in a flowerpot, or on a boat, the person does read the parsha of bikkurim when he brings it, and another Braisa says that he does not read it. Now, according to **Reish Lakish** we can explain the Braisos as the first Braisa referring to the roof of a cave (which is considered like regular land) and the second Braisa referring to the roof of a house, the first Braisa referring to a cultivated ruin and the second Braisa referring to an uncultivated ruin, the first Braisa referring to a flowerpot with a hole and the second Braisa referring to a flowerpot without a hole, and the first Braisa referring to an earthenware boat and the second Braisa referring to a wooden boat. However, how can we explain the Braisos according to **R' Yochanan** who says that we don't even bring bikkurim that grew in these places!? **A:** He holds like the Tanna of another Braisa who says that we don't even bring bikkurim from produce that grew in such places.

V'KULAN EINAN BA'OS ELAH MIN HAMUVCHAR...

- The Gemara tells how the magicians in Mitzrayim scorned Moshe for doing his miracles, saying that Mitzrayim is full of kishuf. They told him, “Are you bringing straw to Aforayim!?” We see that Aforayim was a place of abundant grain and straw.

-----Daf 75-----85-----

MISHNA

- We do not bring the Omer and Shte Halechem from grain that grew in a fertilized field, in an irrigated field, or in an orchard. If grain from these places was used, it is valid.
 - How does one work a land to make it fit to take grain from it for the korbanos? He plows the field the first year and does not plant that year, but instead plants in the second year 70 days before Pesach, and it produces a large amount of flour.
 - How do we examine the flour to see if it has been properly sifted? The Gizbar puts his hand into the flour. If dust-like flour came up in his hand, it is passul until he sifts it again. If the flour became wormy, it is passul.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Does the Mishna mean that he plows in the first year, again in the second year, and then plants, or does the Mishna mean that he plows in the first year and plants without plowing in the second year? **A:** A Braisa says that to produce high quality grain a field should be worked as follows. It should be plowed in the first year and in the second year it should be plowed and then plowed again. It should then be planted 70 days before Pesach so that it grows in the sunny season. This will produce grain that has stalks the size of a zeres and kernels the size of 2 zeres. He then harvests, gathers, threshes, winnows, selects, grinds, and sifts and brings it to the Gizbar. The Gizbar sticks his hand into the flour. If dust comes up with his hand, he tells them to sift it again. In the name of **R' Nosson** they said that the Gizbar smears oil onto his hand and put it into the flour until all the dust has been taken out. Now, the Braisa says that in the second year he plows and repeats the plowing. It is explaining the same process and clearly says that it is plowed in the second year as well, so that must be the proper way to understand the Mishna.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The Mishna certainly doesn't say to plow *twice* in the second year, whereas the Braisa says that it is done twice. There is a contradiction between the Mishna and the Braisa!? **A:** The Mishna is referring to a field that was already worked on, and the Braisa is dealing with a field that had not been worked.
- **Q:** How do we come out regarding the plowing of the field in the second year? **A:** A Braisa says that half the field should be plowed and the other half planted, and the reverse should be done the next year. We see that it does not have to be plowed in the year that it is planted.
- **R' Yochanan** said, we only bring the Omer from grains that grow in the southern fields of EY, because the sun shines on them from sunrise to sunset.
 - A Braisa says this as well. The Braisa says, **Abba Shaul** said, the Omer would be brought from the valley of Beis Makleh, which was the size of 3 se'ah, and was a southern field where the sun shone on it from sunrise to sunset. The field would be plowed and only planted in half the field, and in the next year the other half would be planted in that way.
 - **R' Chilkiya bar Tuvi** would do this with his field – he would only plant half each year – and the field yielded double the amount of produce, which was of very high quality.

V'IHM HISLI'AH PESULA

- A Braisa says, soles flour whose majority became wormy is passul, and wheat kernels whose majority became wormy is passul.
 - **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, does this refer to a majority of the wheat kernel of a majority of the se'ah? **TEIKU.**
- **Q: Rava** asked, if a person made these wormy items kadosh for a mincha, would he get malkus for making a "baal mum" kadosh just as he would if he did so to an animal, or is this something that only applies to an animal? **TEIKU.**
- A Mishna says, any wood that was found to have a worm in it is passul for the Mizbe'ach. **Shmuel** said, this is only in regard to a moist piece of wood, but with regard to a dry piece of wood, the wormy part can be scraped off and it is valid.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, if a person made this wormy wood kadosh, would he get malkus for making a "baal mum" kadosh just as he would if he did so to an animal, or is this something that only applies to an animal? **TEIKU.**

MISHNA

- The oil of Tekoah is the best oil (and the oil for menachos should therefore come from there). **Abba Shaul** says, the second best is the oil of Regev from Eiver HaYarden. The oil of all lands is valid, but they would use the oil from there.
- We do not use oil from olives grown on trees of a fertilized field, or an irrigated field, or from trees that have seeds planted between them. If oil from such trees is used it is valid.
- We do not use "anpiknon" oil, but if it is used it is valid.
- We do not use oil from olives that were soaked in water, or that were pickled, or that were boiled, and if such oil is used it is passul.

GEMARA

- A pasuk tells us that Yoav sent to Tekoah and took a wise woman from there. **R' Yochanan** said, the people of Tekoah were wise, because they would regularly have olive oil in their diet.
- A Braisa says, "v'tovel bashemen raglo" refers to the portion of Asher, where oil flowed like a spring. The Braisa brings a story of a goy who was sent on behalf of his city to buy a tremendous amount of oil from EY. When he got there he was directed to the portion of Asher. He met a simple looking farmer who he was told had a lot of oil. He didn't believe that such a poor looking man could have that amount of oil. It turned out that he had much, much more than he even wanted.

EIN MEVI'IN LO MIBEIS HAZEVALIM

- **Q:** A Braisa says that we may not use "anpiknon" oil and if it is used it is passul, because it is considered to be a secretion, not an oil!? **A: R' Yosef** said, the Braisa follows **R' Chiya** and the Mishna follows **R' Shimon bar Rebbi**.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The pasuk says “Shisha chadashim b’shemem hamor” – **R’ Huna bar Chiya** said, this is balsam oil. **R’ Yirmiya bar Abba** said, this is oil from olives which have not yet grown 1/3.
 - A Braisa says, **R’ Yehuda** says, “anpiknon” is oil from olives which have not yet grown 1/3.
 - People smear such oil on themselves, because it removes hair and causes the skin to shine.

EIN MEVI’IN MIN HAGARGERIN SHENASHRU BAMAYIM

- A Braisa says, oil from olives that were pickled, cooked, or soaked in water, or of olive sediments or oil with a bad smell should not be used, and if it is, it is passul.
 - **Q: Rabba** asked, if a person made this type of oil kadosh, would he get malkus for making a “baal mum” kadosh just as he would if he did so to an animal, or is this something that only applies to an animal?
TEIKU.

-----Daf 15--86-----

MISHNA

- There are 3 times a year that olives are harvested, and each harvest produces 3 different grades of oil.
 - During the first harvest one picks the olives at the top of the tree, he then crushes them and puts them in the basket (where the oil that oozes from them gets filtered through the basket into a keili). **R’ Yehuda** says he puts the olives around the basket. The oil that comes from this stage is the “first” oil. He then presses the olives with a beam. **R’ Yehuda** says it is done with stones. This is the “second” oil. He then crushes the olives again and presses them with a beam again. This is the “third” oil. The “first” oil is valid for the Menorah, the other oils are valid for menachos.
 - During the second harvest one picks the olives at the height of the rooftops. He then crushes them and puts them in the basket (where the oil that oozes from them gets filtered through the basket into a keili). **R’ Yehuda** says he puts the olives around the basket. The oil that comes from this stage is the “first” oil. He then presses the olives with a beam. **R’ Yehuda** says it is done with stones. This is the “second” oil. He then crushes the olives again and presses them with a beam again. This is the “third” oil. The “first” oil is valid for the Menorah, the other oils are valid for menachos.
 - During the third harvest, he packs the olives into the vat until they become spoiled, and then takes them to be dried on the roof. He then crushes them and puts them in the basket (where the oil that oozes from them gets filtered through the basket into a keili). **R’ Yehuda** says he puts the olives around the basket. The oil that comes from this stage is the “first” oil. He then presses the olives with a beam. **R’ Yehuda** says it is done with stones. This is the “second” oil. He then crushes the olives again and presses them with a beam again. This is the “third” oil. The “first” oil is valid for the Menorah, the other oils are valid for menachos.

GEMARA

- **Q:** They asked, in the Mishna’s explanation of the first harvest, does it mean that he picks the olives at the top before all have been given a chance to ripe and he therefore only picks the ripe ones, or does it mean that he waits until they are all ripe and then goes and picks them all? **A:** A Braisa says, if a person promises to bring olive oil to the Beis Hamikdash it must be from the oil that flows out on its own (before it is pressed). From here they said that during the first olive harvest one lets the olives ripen on top of the tree (this is the answer to the question, although the Gemara continues to quote the rest of the Braisa). He brings them to the olive press where he crushes them with the millstones and puts them in baskets. The oil that flows from them is the “first” oil. He then presses them with a beam, and the oil that flows from that is the “second” oil. He then grinds them again and presses them again, and the oil that flows from that is the “third” oil. The first oil is valid for the Menorah, and the second and third oil is valid for the menachos. The second olive harvest is done in this same way. The third olive harvest is done a bit differently. He packs the olives into the vat until they become spoiled, and then takes them to be dried on the roof. He makes them into a pile the shape of a date until the liquids flow. He then crushes them and puts them in the basket (where the oil that oozes from them gets filtered through the basket into a keili). The oil that comes from this stage is the “first” oil. He then presses the olives

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

with a beam. This is the “second” oil. He then crushes the olives again and presses them with a beam again. This is the “third” oil. The “first” oil is valid for the Menorah, the other oils are valid for menachos. **R’ Yehuda** says he would not crush with millstones but rather with a mortar, he would not press with a beam but rather with stones, and he would not put them in the baskets but rather around the baskets.

- **Q:** Our Mishna says that the olives are crushed, which suggests that it is done in a mortar, which is the view of **R’ Yehuda**. The Mishna then says that the olives are placed into the baskets, which is the view of the **Rabanan!**? **A:** The Tanna of the Mishna holds like **R’ Yehuda** in one way and like the **Rabanan** in the other.

MISHNA

- There is no oil better than the first oil of the first harvest. The second oil of the first harvest and the first oil of the second harvest are of equal quality. The third oil of the first harvest, the second oil of the second harvest, and the first oil of the third harvest are of equal quality. The third oil of the second harvest and the second oil of the third harvest are of equal quality. There is nothing of lower quality than the third oil of the third harvest.
- Based on a kal v’chomer we would say that all menachos should require the first oil of the harvest (“shemen zayis zach”), because if the oil for the Menorah, which is not eaten, requires this superior oil, then the oil for a mincha, which is eaten, should certainly be required to be of this quality! The pasuk therefore says “zach kasis lama’or”, which teaches that only the Menorah requires that superior oil, but the menachos do not.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How can we say that the second oil of the first harvest and the first oil of the second harvest are of equal quality, when the first oil of the second harvest can be used for the Menorah and the second oil of the first harvest cannot? **A: R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, this means that they are of equal quality with regard to menachos (one should bring the best oil that he can for a mincha, so if he has these two types of oil, they are considered equal and he can bring whichever he wants).

AHF KOL HAMENACHOS HAYU BADIN...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says that the oil for the Menorah must be “zach”, which means it must be clear. **R’ Yehuda** says that the pasuk says it must be “kasis” which means that the olives must be crushed in a mortar. We would think that such oil would be passul for a mincha. The pasuk therefore says “v’issaron soles balul b’shemen kasis”. If so, why does the pasuk regarding the Menorah say that such oil is for the Menorah? The Torah is looking to lessen the financial burden on the Yidden and allows them to use lower quality oil for their menachos.
- The pasuk says “tzav es Bnei Yisrael v’yikchu eilecha shemen zayis zach”. **R’ Shmuel bar Nachmeini** said, Hashem says “eilecha” – the lighting of the Menorah is for you, I do not need the light.
 - The Shulchan was on the north side and the Menorah was on the south side. **R’ Zrika in the name of R’ Elazar** said, from the fact that they were placed far apart from each other we can learn that it is as if Hashem is saying, I do not need the food or the light.
 - A Braisa says a similar concept regarding the windows of the Beis Hamikdash, which were narrow on the inside and wide on the outside, to show that Hashem does not need the light.
 - The pasuk says that the Menorah should be set up outside the “Paroches Ha’eidus” to serve as a testimony to all that the Shechina dwells with the Yidden. It cannot be thought that Hashem needs the light, for all the years of the travelling in the Midbar, Hashem provided the light for the Yidden.
 - **Q:** How does the Menorah provide testimony? **A: Rava** said, this refers to the western lamp, which got as much oil as all the other lamps and yet it burned much longer than the rest.

MISHNA

- From where did they bring the wine for nesachim? The wines of Keduchim and Atulim are the most superior wines. The wines of Beis Rima and of Beis Lavan in the mountains and of Kfar Signa in the valley are second to them. The wine of all lands is valid, but these lands had the superior wine.
- We do not bring wine from grapes grown in lands that were fertilized, or from irrigated fields, or from grapes that grew on vines that were seeded between them. If he did bring wine from these places, it is valid. We do not

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

bring “elyustun” wine, but if he brought it, it is valid. **Rebbi** says, we may not bring old wine, but the **Chachomim** say it is valid. We may not bring sweet wine, smoked wine, or cooked wine, and if one brought them it is passul. We may not bring wine from grapes grown on vines that were hung on trellises, but rather it should come from vines that grew along the ground and that were grown in cultivated vineyards. We may not put the wine in large keilim, but rather put them into small barrels. We may not fill the barrel to the top, so that it will be fragrant when opened. We may not use the wine at the mouth of the barrel, because of the spoilage that occurs there, and not from the bottom of the barrel, because of the sediment that is there. Rather, the wine should be taken from the middle third of the middle third of the barrel.

- How do we check the wine for quality? The Gizbar sits with a reed in his hand. When the white particles from the sediment starts to come out, he hits the person with the reed to signal him to stop the flow of wine.
 - **R’ Yose the son of R’ Yehuda** said, wine that has spoilage is passul based on the pasuk of “temimim yihiyu lachem uminchasam” (which teaches that a mincha with spoilage, like worms, is passul) and “temimim yihiyu lachem v’niskeyhem” (which teaches that wine with spoilage is passul for nesachim).

-----Daf 1D--87-----

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna says that we may not bring sweet wine and if one did bring such wine it is passul. However, the Mishna also said that we may not bring “elyustun” wine (also a wine that is inferior due to its sweetness), but if he brought it, it is valid!? **A: Ravina** said, the two ruling should be rolled into one – we may not bring “elyustun” wine because we may not bring sweet wine, and if one does it is passul. **A2: R’ Ashi** said, “elyustun” wine is valid b’dieved, because its sweetness is due to its exposure to the sun. The sweet wine that the Mishna says is passul b’dieved refers to wine from grapes that are very sweet (not just due to the sun).

EIN MIVI’IN YASHAN DIVREI REBBI VACHACHOMIM MACHSHIRIN

- **Chizkiya** said, **Rebbi’s** view is based on the pasuk “lakeves yayin”, which he darshens to teach that just as the lamb has to be within its first year, the wine must be within its first year as well.
 - **Q:** Based on this comparison we should say that just as the lamb is passul in its second year the wine should also be passul in its second year, and yet a Braisa says that wine in its second year should not be brought, but if it is brought it would be valid b’dieved!? This must follow **Rebbi**, because he is the one who said that one should not bring old wine!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said that the reason of **Rebbi** is based on the pasuk of “ahl teireh yayin ki yis’adam”, which teaches that wine is at its best when it has its full red color, which is in its first year.

EIN MIVI’IN LO MIN HADALIYOS...

- The cultivated vineyards referred to in the Mishna are vineyards that are worked on twice a year.
 - **R’ Yosef** had a vineyard that he worked on an extra time. It produced such strong wine that it had to be diluted with double the amount of water that was needed for regular wine.

LO HAYU KONSIN OSAN BACHATZAVIN GEDOLIM

- A Braisa says, the small barrels are the size of medium sized jugs from Lod. We do not put two of them next to each other, rather each one separately.

KEITZAD BODEK...

- A Braisa says, when the beginning of the sediments would start to flow from the barrel, the Gizbar would hit the person with the reed to signal him to stop the flow.
 - **Q:** Why couldn’t he just tell him to stop? **A:** This supports **R’ Yochanan** who said that just as speaking is beneficial for spices, it is bad for wine.

R’ YOSE BAR R’ YEHUDA OMER...

- **Q: Rava** asked, if a person made this type of spoiled wine kadosh, would he get malkus for making a “baal mum” kadosh just as he would if he did so to an animal, or is this something that only applies to an animal? **TEIKU**.
- A Braisa says, the best rams come from Moav, the best lambs come from Chevron, the best calves come from Sharon, and the best birds come from Har Hamelech. **R’ Yehuda** says, we should bring lambs that are as tall as they are wide.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Rava bar R' Shila** said, **R' Yehuda's** statement is based on the pasuk of “yir'eh miknecha bayom hahu kar nirchav”.
- A pasuk says that there will be watchmen set by the walls of Yerushalayim and they will never be silent. What will they be saying? **Rava bar R' Shila** said, they will say “atah sakum tiracheim tziyon”. **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, they will say “bonei Yerushalayim Hashem”. Given that they are both pesukim discussing the Redemption, what was said before the Churban? **Rava bar R' Shila** said, they would say “ki vachar Hashem b'tziyon eva l'moshav lo”.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL KORBANOS HATZIBBUR!!!

PEREK SHTEI MIDDOS -- PEREK ASIRI

MISHNA

- There are two types of measures used to measure dry things (solids) in the Beis Hamikdash – the issaron and the half issaron. **R' Meir** says, there was the issaron, the issaron (a second type of issaron) and the half issaron.
 - What was the issaron measure used for? They would use it to measure the flour for all the menachos. Even for the mincha that accompanied a par, which requires 3 issarons, or for a mincha that accompanied a ram, which requires 2 issaron, they would not measure in larger measures, but would instead use the issaron measure.
 - What was the half issaron used for? They would use it to measure the flour for the chavitei Kohen Gadol, which was brought half in the morning and half in the afternoon.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R' Meir** would say, the pasuk of “issaron issaron lakeves ha'echad” teaches that there were 2 issaron measures in the Beis Hamikdash – one measured an issaron that was piled high (it held an issaron when it was filled over its rim) and the other measured a level issaron (it measured an issaron within the confines of the keili). The smaller one that would have to be piled above to reach an issaron would be used for all menachos, and the level issaron was used for measuring the chavitei Kohen Gadol. The **Chachomim** say there was only one issaron measure there, as the pasuk says “v'issaron echad lakeves ha'echad”. The double use in the pasuk of “issaron issaron” comes to teach that a half issaron measure was used as well.
 - **Q:** How does **R' Meir** learn that there was a half issaron measure? **A:** He learns it from the “vuv” of “v'issaron”. The **Rabanan** don't darshen the vuv.
 - **Q:** What does **R' Meir** learn from the pasuk of “v'issaron echad lakeves ha'echad”? **A:** He says it teaches that we do not measure with a 3 issaron measure for the mincha that accompanies a par (even though it needs 3 issaron we measure it from a single issaron measure three times) or a 2 issaron measure for the mincha that accompanies a ram. The **Rabanan** learn this from the dot that is found on top of the “vuv” of “issaron”. **R' Meir** does not darshen the dot.

CHATZI ISSARON MEH HAYA MISHAMEISH...

- **Q:** We have learned that the chavitei Kohen Gadol was brought as a full issaron and then split into two, so why would it be measured in a half issaron measure? **A:** **R' Sheishes** said, the Mishna means that when it is divided, it is divided using the half issaron measure.
- **Q:** **Rami bar Chama** asked **R' Chisda**, according to **R' Meir** was the half issaron measure a half issaron only when piled above the rim or was it a half issaron within the rim? **R' Chisda** asked, why don't you ask this according to the **Rabanan** as well? **Rami bar Chama** said, according to the **Rabanan** we can even ask whether the issaron measure was an issaron within the rim or not, and since I am focusing on the half issaron I asked it according to **R' Meir**. **A:** **R' Chisda** said, since **R' Meir** said that the issaron measure used for the chavitin was an issaron within the rim, it must be that the half issaron was also made that way. And, since **R' Meir** holds this way, it must be that the **Rabanan** hold this way as well.
- **Q:** **Rami bar Chama** asked **R' Chisda**, was the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol divided by hand or only by using a measuring keili? **A:** **R' Chisda** said, it must have been done by hand, and need not be divided perfectly, because

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

that would require us to bring in a scale into the Mikdash, which we would not do because it is associated with a curse (one of the curses is that people will have to measure their bread because of a lack of food).

- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked **R' Chisda**, does the Shulchan have the ability to make a kometz of levonah kadosh (if it is just piled onto the Shulchan without being in a keili)? Do we say that since it can make the breads kadosh it can also make the levonah kadosh or not? **A: R' Chisda** said, it cannot make it kadosh.
 - **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, **R' Yochanan** seems to say that the space above the Shulchan can make things kadosh!? **A: R' Chisda** said, I meant that it can't make it kadosh to the point that it can be offered on the Mizbe'ach, but it can make it kadosh enough that it can become passul.

-----Daf 78-----

MISHNA

- There were seven liquid measures in the Mikdash: hin, half hin, third of a hin, quarter hin, lug, half lug, and quarter lug. **R' Eliezer bar R' Tzadok** said, the hin measure had demarcations on it which indicated: until this place for the par, until this place for the ram, and until this place for the lamb. **R' Shimon** said, there was no hin measure in the Mikdash, because what purpose would it serve (there is nothing that is brought in the amount of a hin)! Rather, the seventh measure was a 1.5 lug measure, which they used to measure the oil for the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol, which needed 1.5 lug in the morning and 1.5 lug in the afternoon.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, there were seven liquid measures in the Mikdash. **R' Yehuda** says they were the quarter lug, the half lug, the lug, the quarter hin, the third of a hin, the half hin, and the hin. **R' Meir** says they were the hin, the half hin, the third of a hin, the quarter hin, the lug, the half lug, and the quarter lug. **R' Shimon** says there was no hin measure in the Mikdash, because what purpose would it serve? Rather, the seventh measure was a 1.5 lug measure, which they used to measure the oil for the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol, which needed 1.5 lug in the morning and 1.5 lug in the afternoon. They said to **R' Shimon**, there is a half lug measure there, so to measure out 1.5 lug, the half lug could have been used (it could be filled 3 times). **R' Shimon** said, according to you, why did there need to be a half lug measure? There is a quarter lug and that can be used to measure anything that needs to be a half lug!? Rather, the rule in the Mikdash was that a keili that was used to measure a certain amount could not be used to measure a different amount.
 - **Q:** What is the difference between **R' Yehuda** and **R' Meir**? **A: R' Yochanan** said, the difference is the amount of liquid that is above the rim of the keili. According to **R' Yehuda** this amount becomes kodesh as well, and Moshe was instructed to make the quarter lug and to then make the next size keili to be large enough to hold the contents of the smaller size keili with this amount that is above the rim (e.g. the half lug had to be large enough to hold two quarter lugs with the amounts over the rims). **R' Meir** holds that the amount above the rim does not become kodesh, and Moshe was instructed to make the hin measure and to then make the smaller measure so that anything over the rim of the hin would not fit (e.g. the half hin should hold exactly half a hin, so that two half hins held exactly one hin, not any of the overage of the hin). **A2: Abaye** said, it may be that they both say that the overage is kadosh or that the overage is not kadosh. They argue regarding the meaning of the word "mileyim" used regarding the liquid measures. **R' Meir** says this teaches that the measures must be exact – not more or less than the measure. Therefore, the hin must be made first and from there we can get to the smaller measures. **R' Yehuda** holds that "mileyim" means that the measures may not be less than they are supposed to be, but they can be more. Therefore, we can even begin by making the smaller measure and using that to get to the larger measure.
- **Q: R' Shimon** seems to have answered convincingly, that the hin was only used once in history – for Moshe to make the "shemen hamishcha", and if so there is no reason to have that measure in the Mikdash!? **A:** The **Rabanan** said, it was there for Moshe, as the pasuk says "v'shemen zayis hin". **R' Shimon** holds that the measure was made for Moshe, but since it was no longer needed they then hid it, and the **Rabanan** say that once it was made it remained in the Mikdash even though there was no longer a need for it.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Shimon** says that since the hin measure was not there, we must find another measure that was there in its place. Why do we need to have a replacement measure? **A:** We have a kabbalah that there were 7 liquid measure in the Mikdash. If he says the hin was not there, we must find another that was there in its place.
- **Q:** How can **R' Elazar the son of R' Tzadok** say that there was only a single measure in the Mikdash – a hin with demarcations? Doesn't he agree that there were 7 measures? **A:** He does not have that kabbalah and therefore does not require that there be 7 measures. **A2:** He holds that the kabbalah is that there must be 7 measurements, but not necessarily that there be 7 measuring keilim.

MISHNA

- What was the “revi'is” (the quarter lug measure) used for? It was used to measure the revi'is of water needed for a metzora, and for the revi'is of oil for a nazir.
 - What was the half lug measure used for? It was used to measure the half lug of water needed for a sotah, and the half lug of oil needed for a Todah.
 - The lug measure was used to measure oil for all the menachos. Even if a mincha of 60 issaron of flour was brought, which would (according to some) require 60 lug of oil, the lug measure was used to measure the oil (it was filled 60 times). **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** says, even a mincha of 60 issaron would only come with one lug of oil, based on the pasuk of “l' mincha v'lug shamen”.
 - A measure of 6 lug (which is the half hin measure) was used for the mincha and nesachim that accompany a par.
 - A measure of 4 lug (the third of a hin measure) was used for the mincha and nesachim that accompany a ram.
 - A measure of 3 lug (the quarter lug measure) was used for the mincha and nesachim that accompany a lamb.
 - Three and one half lug were used for the Menorah – half a lug for each lamp.

GEMARA

- **Q: Rabbi** asked, why was the revi'is measure anointed and made kadosh? If it was made to measure the water needed for a metzora and make it kadosh, that process is done outside the Azarah, and as such did not need the water to be kadosh (which is what happens when it is put into a kli kodesh)!? If it was to measure the oil for a nazir's mincha and make it kadosh, we have learned that the nazir's breads only become kadosh with the shechting of the ram!? **A: R' Chiya** said, it was used to measure the oil for the chavitei Kohen Gadol, which needed a revi'is for each challah. **Rabbi** praised **R' Chiya** for this answer.

CHATZI LUG MEH HAYA MISHAMEISH

- **Q: Rabbi** asked, why was the half lug measure anointed and made kadosh? If it was made to measure the water needed for a sotah, that water came from the kiyor and was already kadosh, and therefore did not need to be made kadosh!? If it was to measure the oil for the Todah and make it kadosh, we have learned that the Todah breads become kadosh with the shechting of the korbon!? **A: R' Shimon the son of Rabbi** said, it was anointed for its use when measuring the oil needed for each lamp of the Menorah. **Rabbi** praised his son for this answer.
- **R' Yochanan in the name of Rabbi** said, if a lamp of the Menorah went out before it was supposed to, and the oil became full of ash or the wick became ash, what is done? He cleans out the lamp, puts in new oil, and lights it.
 - **Q: R' Zrika** asked, does he put in as much oil as if he were lighting it for the entire night, or only enough to replace the amount of oil that had been taken out? **A: R' Yirmiya** said, it must be that he puts in the full amount, because it is impossible to know how much oil had been taken out. You can't say that he measures what is taken out, because there were only 7 measures, and this would require many more measures. **R' Zrika** praised **R' Yirmiya** for this answer.
 - We find that **R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan** said like **R' Yirmiya** as well.
- **R' Huna the son of R' Yehuda in the name of R' Sheishes** said, the lamps of the Menorah in the Mikdash were made to be bendable, to allow for a thorough cleaning.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- He holds that when the pasuk requires that the Menorah be “kikar” and “miksha” it refers to the Menorah and the lamps (therefore these pieces could not be removed) and the only way to facilitate a thorough cleaning was to make it bendable.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that the lamps were removed from the Menorah when they had to be cleaned!? **A: R’ Sheishes** holds like the **Rabanan** who say in a Braisa that the lamps would not be removed, which must mean that they *could not* be removed.
 - The view of the **Rabanan** is the view of **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Tzadok** in a Braisa.
 - They argue in the same machlokes as other Tanna’im in a Braisa, where the **T”K** says that the lamps were part of the “kikar” of gold from which the Menorah was created, and **R’ Nechemya** says that the lamps were not part of that.
 - The Gemara explains that they argue based on how they darshen the pesukim written regarding the Menorah.

-----Daf װד---89-----

CHATZI LUG SHEMEN L’TODAH

- A Braisa says, **R’ Akiva** says, why does the pasuk regarding the not chametz Todah breads say “bashemen...bashamen” (using the word twice)? If it would only say it once we would think that these 30 loaves should get a full lug of oil just like all other menachos. The pasuk therefore repeats the word, creating a “ribuy” followed by a “ribuy”, which serves to limit and teach that these 30 only get a half lug of oil. [The Gemara asks, one of the words is needed and therefore it is only one that can be used as a drasha for a “ribuy”!? The Gemara answers, the pasuk didn’t have to say the word even once, and we would have learned from other menachos that it requires a lug. The fact that it says it twice acts to limit the amount of oil to a half lug.] The Braisa continues, we would think that the half lug should be divided into 3 equal parts, with one part for the challos, one for the rekikin, and one for the revicha. The pasuk says “bashemen” regarding the revichin, which teaches that it should get more oil than the other two kinds. Therefore, we divide the half lug into two – half goes for the revichin and half goes for the challos and rekikin. **R’ Elazar ben Azarya** said to **R’ Akiva**, I do not agree with your drasha. Rather, the halacha of a half lug for the loaves of a Todah that are not chametz, and the revi’is of oil for a nazir, and the 11 days between one niddah period and the next are all Halacha L’Moshe MiSinai.

BALUG HAYA MODEID

- A Braisa says, regarding a poor metzora’s korbos the pasuk says “issaron...balul...v’lug”. The **Chachomim** say that this teaches that each issaron requires a lug of oil. **R’ Nechemya and R’ Eliezer ben Yaakov** say that even a mincha that is brought of 60 issaron only comes with one lug of oil, based on the pasuk of “l’mincha v’lug shamen”.
 - **Q:** What do **R’ Nechemya and R’ Eliezer** learn from “issaron...balul...v’lug”? **A:** This was needed to teach that the poor metzora brings a mincha of only one issaron. The **Rabanan** say this is not needed for that, because from the fact that a wealthy metzora brings 3 korbos and 3 issaron of flour, it must be that the poor metzora who brings one korbos brings one issaron. The other Tanna’im say that since we find that the Torah had pity and allowed him to bring a much less expensive korbos, we would think that he would not have to bring a mincha at all. Therefore we need the pasuk to teach that he must bring a mincha. The **Rabanan** say, we would never have thought that he is totally patur from a mincha, and the pasuk is not needed to teach that.
 - **Q:** What do the **Rabanan** learn from the pasuk of “l’mincha v’lug shamen”? **A:** They say that it teaches that if one donates a mincha he should never donate less flour than would require a lug – which is an issaron of flour. The other Tanna’im say that we can learn that from the pasuk as well.

SHISHA L’PAR ARBA’AH L’AYIL SHLOSHA L’KEVES

- **Q:** How do we know this? **A:** The pasuk says “v’niskeyhem chatzi hahin yihiyeh lapar”. We know that a hin is 12 lug, based on the pasuk “shemen zayis hin” and the pasuk regarding that oil says “zeh”, which is gematriya 12. Therefore, a half hin is equal to 6 lug, a third of a hin is equal to 4 lug, and a quarter hin is equal to 3 lug.

SHLOSHA UMECHETZA LAMENORAH CHATZI LUG L’CHOL NER

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** How do we know this? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk says “mei’erev ahd boker”, which teaches that it should be given enough oil so that it can last from evening until morning. Another drasha is that this is the only Avodah that is valid to be done from evening until morning. The **Chachomim** determined that a half lug is what is needed to keep it burning from evening until morning.

MISHNA

- We may mix the nesachim of parim with the nesachim of rams, the nesachim of lambs with the nesachim of lambs, the nesachim of an individual with the nesachim of the tzibbur, and the nesachim of today with the nesachim of yesterday. However, we may not mix the nesachim of lambs with the nesachim of bulls and rams. If the ingredients of the ones which may not be mixed were first mixed themselves (properly) and were then mixed with the other type, it would be valid. If it became mixed with the other type before they were properly mixed, they are passul.
- With regard to the lamb brought with the Omer, although the mincha is doubled (it is made of two issaron instead of one), its nesachim are not doubled.

GEMARA

- **Q:** A Braisa says that the pasuk of “v’hiktiro” (he should burn “it”) teaches that one may not mix parts of one korbon with parts of another korbon!? **A: R’ Yochanan** said, the Mishna does not mean that they may be mixed l’chatchila. It means that if they became mixed it is valid b’dieved.
 - **Q:** The later part of the Mishna says that we may not mix the nesachim of lambs with the nesachim of bulls and rams. According to what was just said this would mean that even b’dieved it would be passul. However, the Mishna then says that if the ingredients were first mixed and then they became mixed in the other kind it is valid. This means that the Mishna that said that they should not be mixed is only discussing l’chatchila!? **A: Abaye** said, the Mishna means that if the flour and oil of the different types become mixed, which is never allowed l’chatchila, then we are allowed to mix their wine even l’chatchila.
 - **Q:** That would mean that if the flour and oil were not mixed together we would not be allowed to mix their wine l’chatchila. However, a Braisa seems to say that the wines may even be mixed l’chatchila!? **A:** Rather, **Abaye** said, where the flour and oil were already offered on the Mizbe’ach, the wine may be mixed even l’chatchila. If they were not yet offered on the Mizbe’ach, then if flour and oil were mixed we may then mix their wines, but if the flour and oils were not mixed we may not mix their wines as a gezeira that mixing the wines may lead to the mixing of the flour and oil as well.

KEVES HABAH IHM HA’OMER

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the lamb that is brought with the Omer says “uminchaso shnei esronim” which teaches that the amount of flour in the mincha is doubled. We would think that the wine should also be doubled, so the pasuk says “v’nisko yayin revi’is hahin”. We would think that the wine is not doubled because it is not mixed with the mincha, but the oil which is mixed with the mincha should be doubled. The pasuk therefore says “v’nisko”, to teach that it is not doubled. **R’ Elazar** explains, the word “v’nisko” is written with a “hey” which is the feminine, and we read it as if there was a “vuv” which is the masculine. This teaches that it refers to the oil for the mincha (mincha is a feminine word) and to the wine for the lamb (keves is masculine), and teaches that neither of them are doubled.
- **R’ Yochanan** said, the asham of a metzora that was shechted not lishma requires nesachim, because if you don’t say that, you have made it passul.
 - **Q: R’ Menashyeh bar Gada** asked, based on this, if the lamb brought with the Omer was shechted not lishma, its mincha should still be doubled, because if you don’t say that, you have made it passul!? Also, if the morning Tamid was shechted not lishma it should still need one Kohen to put two pieces of wood on the Mizbe’ach, because if you don’t say that, you have made it passul!? Also, if the afternoon Tamid was shechted not lishma it should require two Kohanim to put the two pieces of wood, because if you don’t say that, you have made it passul!? **A:** All this is true, and **Abaye** explains that **R’ Yochanan** just

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

chose one example to state his ruling. **A2: Rava** said, the Tamid and the lamb of the Omer are Olos, and therefore even if they are not fit for the obligatory Olah, they can be brought as a donated Olah. However, the metzora's Asham, if it is not brought as it is supposed to be brought, we can't simply say that it is treated as a donated ashram, because there is no concept of a donated ashram!

- A Braisa says like **R' Yochanan**. The Braisa says, the ashram of a metzora that was shechted not lishma or from which the blood was not placed onto the thumbs of the metzora, it is still offered on the Mizbe'ach and requires nesachim, but the metzora must bring another ashram to complete his tahara process.