



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Menachos, Daf ז – Daf יז

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 ז--90-----

MISHNA

- All the dry measures in the Beis Hamikdash needed to be filled above the rim, except for the Kohen Gadol's measure, which held the measure within the rim.
- The liquid measures make kodesh even what is above their rim, whereas the dry measures do not. **R' Akiva** says, liquid measures are kodesh and therefore the liquid above the rim becomes kodesh as well. The dry measures are not kodesh, and therefore the solids above the rim are also not kodesh. **R' Yose** says, this is not the reason. Rather, it is because the liquid in the keili moves from the bottom to the top as it is poured, so all of it has been within the confines of the keili. This does not happen to solids that are poured into a keili, and therefore it is only what is inside the keili that is kodesh.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Who is the Tanna of our Mishna (who holds that there was more than one measure that needed to be filled above the rim)? It can't be **R' Meir**, because he says that there was only one such measure! It also can't be the **Rabanan**, because they hold that there were no such measures! **A:** **R' Chisda** said, the Mishna follows **R' Meir**, and the Mishna doesn't mean "all measures", but rather that all measurements done in that one measure had to be done by filling it above the rim.

MIDOS HALACH BEIRUTZEYHEN KODESH

- **Q:** What is the point of machlokes between the three views? **A:** The **T"K** holds that the liquid measures were anointed on the inside and outside (which is why the amount above the rim becomes kadosh) whereas the solid measure were anointed only on the inside. **R' Akiva** holds that that the liquid measures were anointed on the inside and outside (which is why the amount above the rim becomes kadosh) whereas the solid measure were not anointed at all (which is why even the flour inside the measure does not become kodesh). **R' Yose** holds that the liquid and solid measures were anointed inside but not on the outside, and the reason they are treated differently is because the liquid in the keili moves from the bottom to the top as it is poured so the liquid above the rim was at one time within the keili, whereas by solids this does not happen.
 - **Q:** Why do we care if it used to be within the keili? The person only intends that the amount that he needs should become kadosh, so why does the amount above become kadosh? **A:** **R' Dimi bar Shininah in the name of Rav** said, from here we see that a kli shareis makes kadosh even without intent. **A2:** **Ravina** said, we can even say that a kli shareis does not make kadosh without intent, and the extra liquid is only kadosh D'Rabanan, as a gezeira that people shouldn't say that something that was in a kli shareis was then made into chullin.
 - **Q:** **R' Zeira** asked, a Mishna says that if the Lechem Hapanim and levonah was not put on the Shulchan until Sunday (it is supposed to be done on Shabbos) then it should not be taken off that following Shabbos, rather it should be left on the Shulchan until the second Shabbos passes. Now, according to **Ravina** we should say that it should not be allowed to be left beyond the first Shabbos as a gezeira that people will say that something can be left in a kli shareis passed its proper time and not become passul! **A:** You can't ask from the Lechem Hapanim, because that is something that is done in the Heichal, which means that people will not see this happen, therefore there is no reason to be goizer.
- A Mishna says, the excess of nesachim is used for voluntary korbanos to be offered when the Mizbe'ach is sitting idle.
 - **Q:** What is meant by "excess nesachim"? **A:** **R' Chiya bar Yosef** said, it refers to the amount over the rim of the measures. **A2:** **R' Yochanan** said, this refers to what was taught that if Hekdesh made a deal to

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

buy flour at a certain price for the year and the costs of flour then increased, Hekdesh still pays the lower price. If the price decreased, Hekdesh would pay the lower price (or would receive extra flour). It is this extra flour that is bring referred to as “excess nesachim”.

- There is a Braisa that says like **R' Chiya bar Yosef's** interpretation, and a Braisa that says like **R' Yochanan's** interpretation.

MISHNA

- All korbanos of the tzibbur and of an individual require nesachim, except for the korbon bechor, maaser, Pesach, chatas, and asham. The one exception to this is the chatas and asham of a metzora, which do require nesachim.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk of “va'asisem isheh laHashem” written regarding the nesachim obligation would seem to teach that any korbon that is offered on the Mizbe'ach, even a korbon mincha, would require nesachim. The pasuk therefore says “olah”, to limit it to an olah. How do we know to include a shalamim in this obligation as well? The pasuk says “zevach”. How do we know to include Todah as well? The pasuk says “oy zevach”. We would think to even include a bechor, maaser, Pesach, chatas and asham. The pasuk therefore says “lifalei neder oy nedavah”, which teaches that only something that can be donated requires nesachim. I would think to therefore also exclude the obligatory korbanos of Yom Tov that are brought on Yom Tov – the olos re'iyah and the shalmei chagigah – the pasuk therefore says “oy bimo'adeychem”, which teaches that anything that comes for the Yom Tov requires nesachim. We would think to also include a goat chatas since it is brought on Yom Tov as well. The pasuk of “v'chi saaseh ben bakar” comes to teach that just as a “ben bakar” is something that can be donated as a korbon, so too things that can be donated require nesachim. This excludes the chatas. The pasuk says “laasos reyach nicho'ach laHashem min habakar oy min hatzon”. This teaches that a bird olah does not require nesachim. This is the view of **R' Yoshiya**. **R' Yonason** says, we already know that from the fact that the pasuk says “zevach”, and a bird is not a “zevach”. Rather, “min habakar oy min hatzon” teaches that if someone promises to bring an olah he need not bring an animal from the bakar and an animal from the tzon (as would possibly be implied by another pasuk), but rather need only bring one.
 - **Q: R' Yonason** holds that unless a pasuk specifically uses the word “yachdav” it means that the items are separate, so why do we need a pasuk to teach that they are not together? **A:** We would think that the vuv of “umin hatzon” serves as if it would have said “yachdav”.
 - **Q: R' Yoshiya** holds that even without saying “yachdav” we need a pasuk to teach that something is separate. If so, he should need a pasuk that only one animal is needed to fulfil a neder!? **A:** One pasuk says “ihm olah korbano min habakar” and another pasuk says “v'ihm min hatzon korbano”. The fact that the Torah separated them into separate pesukim teaches that only one needs to be brought to fulfil an obligation. **R' Yonason** would say that these pesukim may be talking about where the neder was made to specifically bring either a bakar or a tzon. However, if there was no such specification, we would think that he must bring both. That is why the pasuk regarding nesachim is needed to teach that even one animal suffices.

-----Daf נ"ט-----91-----

- The Braisa said that we learn that a Todah requires zevachim from the pasuk of “oy zevach”.
 - **Q:** A Todah is also a “zevach” and should be included in that word, so why do we need the word “oy” to include it? **A:** We would think that since the Todah is brought with breads, it should not need nesachim. That is why we need the word “oy” to teach that it does.
 - **Q:** Why would we think it should be different that the nazir's ram, which is brought with breads and still needs nesachim!? **A:** The nazir's ram only comes with two types of breads, and maybe that is why it needs nesachim, but the Todah comes with 4 breads and therefore we would think that it does not need nesachim.
- **Q:** The Gemara continues to ask on the drashos of the Braisa. Why did the pasuk have to say “olah” if it says “lifalei neder oy bindava”? **A:** If we didn't have the word “olah” we would say that “va'asisem isheh laHashem” is

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

a klal, “lifalei neder oy bindava” is a prat, and “laasos reyach nicho’ach” is another klal. This would create a klal uprat uklal which would teach that just as the prat is something that does not come as a kapparah for an aveira, so too the only korbanos that require nesachim are korbanos that are not brought as a kapparah for an aveira. This would exclude chatas and ashm but would include bechor, maaser and Pesach (since they are not brought as a kapparah for an aveira). The word “olah” is written to make it part of the prat, and the klal uprat uklal therefore teaches that only korbanos like the olah – a korbon which one is not obligated in – require nesachim. This comes to include the offspring of korbanos, a temurah, olos brought from extra items of kodashim, an ashm that has been sent to graze and get a mum, and all korbanos that were shechted not lishma.

- **Q:** The Braisa said that “oy” in the pasuk is used for a drasha to show that the items are separate. If this word is to be darshened in this way, how will we darshen it in the pasuk of “lifalei neder oy bindava”? **A:** We would have thought that a person need not bring nesachim unless he is bringing a neder and a nedava. The “oy” teaches that one who brings either one alone is required to bring nesachim as well.
 - **Q:** This makes sense according to **R’ Yoshiya** (who says that a drasha is needed to separate things even if the word “yachdav” is not written). However, according to **R’ Yonason** who says that without the word “yachdav” we don’t need a word to teach that items are separate, what does this “oy” come to teach? **A:** We would think that a neder brought on its own and a nedava brought on its own needs nesachim, but when a neder and nedava are brought together they only need one set of nesachim. The word “oy” teaches that even in this case each would need its own nesachim.
 - **Q:** What does the word “oy bimo’adeychem” come to teach? **A:** We would think that when a neder and nedava are brought there is an obligation to bring two separate nesachim, but when two nedarim or two nedavos are brought one set of nesachim is enough. The pasuk teaches that even then he must bring two sets of nesachim.
 - **Q:** What does the “oy” of the pasuk “v’chi saaseh ben bakar olah oy zavach” teach? **A:** We would think that if a person brings two of the same korbon (e.g. two olos or two shelamim), one as a neder and one as a nedava, it would only require one set of nesachim, because they are the same type of korbon. The pasuk teaches that they are separate korbanos and therefore each one requires its own set of nesachim.
 - **Q:** What does the “oy” of the pasuk “lifalei neder oy shelamim” teach? **A:** We would think that if a person brings two of the same korbon (e.g. two olos or two shelamim) as a neder and two of that same korbon as a nedava, it would only require one set of nesachim, because they are the same type of korbon and the same type of obligation. The pasuk teaches that they are separate korbanos and therefore each one requires its own set of nesachim.
- **Q:** What does **R’ Yoshiya** do with the pasuk of “min habakar oy min hatzon”? **A:** We would think that separate nesachim for separate korbanos only need be brought when the korbanos are of different animals, but if they are of the same animal type then one nesachim should suffice. The pasuk teaches that this is not so.
 - **Q:** What is taught by the pasuk of “kacha taasu la’echad”? **A:** We would think that separate nesachim are only needed when the korbanos are brought one after the other, but if they are brought at the same time one nesachim would suffice. The pasuk teaches that even then two would be needed.

ELAH SHECHATASO SHEL METZORA VA’ASHAMO TA’UN NESACHIM

- **Q:** How do we know this? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the metzora’s korbanos says “ushlosa esronim soles mincha”. This refers to the mincha that comes with the korbon. Maybe it refers to a mincha that must be brought on its own? The pasuk says “v’hela haKohen es ha’olah v’es hamincha”, which shows that the mincha accompanies the korbon. Still, we do not know if it needs nesachim as well. The pasuk therefore says, “v’yayin lanesech revi’is hahin taaseh ahl ha’olah oy lazavach lakeves ha’echad” – olah refers to the metzora’s olah, zavach refers to the metzora’s chatas, “oy” lazavach refers to the metzora’s ashm.
 - **Q:** Why can’t the ashm be learned from “zavach” as well, as we find elsewhere that the chatas and ashm are learned from the same word!? **A:** That is only when they are being brought for the same purpose. However, here the ashm is coming to permit him and the chatas is coming as a kappara, so we need a separate pasuk to teach regarding the ashm.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Why don't we say that "zavach" refers to the chatas and asham of the nazir? **A:** A Braisa learns from a drasha of a pasuk that the chatas and asham of the nazir do not require nesachim. Therefore, the pasuk of "zavach" can't be coming to include those korbanos.
- **Q:** Why does the Braisa say that "olah" refers to the olah of a metzora? Maybe it refers to the olah of a woman who has given birth? **A:** **Abaye** said, a Braisa learns from "lakeves ha'echad" at the end of the pasuk that the olah of a woman who has given birth requires nesachim. Therefore, "olah" does not refer to that. **A2: Rava** said, that a metzora is the person who would need three inclusionary words for his 3 korbanos. Therefore, the pasuk which has 3 inclusionary words must refer to him.
- **Q:** Why does the pasuk say that a ram requires nesachim, since this is known from elsewhere? **A:** **R' Sheishes** said, this comes to include the ram of the Kohen Gadol that is brought on Yom Kippur.
 - **Q:** That is known from the word "bimo'adeychem"! **A:** We would think that that only requires nesachim for korbanos of the tzibbur, not for an individual.
 - **Q:** Why would we think it is different than the personal korban of the woman who has given birth, which we said requires nesachim? **A:** We would think that is different, because it has no set time when it must be brought, and that is why it requires nesachim.
- **Q:** Why does the pasuk say "oy la'ayil"? **A:** It comes to include a "palgas" (an animal between the stages of being a keves and an ayil) in the nesachim requirement.
 - **Q:** That makes sense according to **R' Yochanan**, who says that a palgas is considered to be a separate entity (than the keves and the ayil). However, **Bar Pada** says that a palgas is a safek as to what it is classified as, so it can't be what is referred to by the pasuk!? **A:** According to **Bar Pada** this remains a KASHYEH.
- **Q:** The pasuk regarding nesachim says "kacha yei'aseh lashor ha'echad oy la'ayil ha'echad oy laseh bakvasim oy ba'izim". What does "lashor ha'echad" come to teach? **A:** We would think that just as there is a difference between the nesachim brought with a lamb and those brought with a ram (same animal of different ages), there is likewise a difference between the nesachim brought with a par and those brought with a calf (also the same animal of different ages). The pasuk therefore teaches that it is the same for both of these animals.
 - **Q:** What does "oy la'ayil" teach? **A:** We would think that just as there is a difference between the nesachim of a lamb and a ram (the animal in its first year and the animal in its second year) there should likewise be a difference between the animal in its second year and the animal in its third year. The pasuk of "oy la'ayil ha'echad" therefore teaches that there is no difference.
 - **Q:** What does "oy laseh bakvasim" teach? **A:** We would think that just as there is a difference between the nesachim of a male lamb and a male ram, there should likewise be a difference between the nesachim of a female lamb and a female ram. The pasuk teaches that there is no difference.
 - **Q:** What does "oy ba'izim" teach? **A:** We would think that just as there is a difference between the nesachim of a male lamb and a male ram, there should likewise be a difference between the nesachim of a young goat and an older goat. The pasuk therefore teaches that there is no difference.
 - **R' Pappa** said, **Rava** would test us by asking how much wine is needed for the nesachim of a female ram. **R' Pappa** would answer from a Mishna which shows that there is no difference in the amount of nesachim needed for a female lamb and a female ram.

-----Daf כ"ט-----92-----

MISHNA

- All korbanos of the tzibbur do not require semicha, except for the par helam davar and the goat that is sent to the Azazel. **R' Shimon** says that the male goat chatas brought for the tzibbur's aveira of avodah zara based on an erroneous psak of Beis Din also gets semicha.
- All korbanos of an individual require semicha, except for the korbanos of bechor, maaser, and Pesach.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If an heir brings a korban on behalf of his father he does semicha, brings nesachim, and can effect temurah.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, all korbanos of the tzibbur do not require semicha, except for the par helam davar and the male goat chatas brought for the tzibbur's aveira of avodah zara based on an erroneous psak of Beis Din – this is the view of **R' Shimon**. **R' Yehuda** says that this chatas for the aveira of avoda zara does not get semicha. In its place (in the list of tzibbur korbanos that get semicha) put the goat that is sent to the Azazel. [Q: Why does **R' Yehuda** feel that something must be put in its place in the list? **A: Ravina** said, we have a kabbalah that there are two tzibbur korbanos that require semicha.] **R' Shimon** said to **R' Yehuda**, the semicha must be done by the owners, and it is the Kohen Gadol who does the semicha on the goat to be sent to the Azazel, and this goat only brings a kapparah for non-Kohanim! **R' Yehuda** said, the Kohanim also get a kapparah from this goat and the Kohen Gadol's semicha is therefore a proper semicha to be counted in the list of tzibbur korbanos that get semicha.
 - We see in a Braisa that they argue regarding who gets a kapparah from the Azazel goat. The Braisa darshens the pesukim that discuss the kapparah brought about by the Yom Kippur Avodah. "V'chiper es mikdash hakodesh" refers to a kapparah for tumah in the Kodosh Hakodashim; "Ohel Moed" refers to the Heichal; "Mizbe'ach" refers to the Mizbe'ach"; "Yichaper" refers to the Azaros. "HaKohanim" refers to the Kohanim; "Am Hakahal" refers to the Yisraelim; "Yichaper" refers to the Levi'im. The pasuk puts all these people together to teach that all received a kapparah through the goat that is sent to the Azazel. **R' Shimon** says that the par brings kapparah for the Kohanim and the goats bring a kapparah for the rest of the Yidden.
 - The result of this machlokes is that **R' Yehuda** holds that non-Kohanim get a kapparah for "tumas Mikdash ukedashav" from the goat that is offered inside the Heichal, and the Kohanim get a kapparah for this from Aharon's par. With regard to all other aveiros, all Yidden get a kapparah from the viduy said over the Azazel goat. **R' Shimon** holds that the Kohanim's kapparah for other aveiros comes from the viduy said on the par.
 - They argue in a Mishna as well. The Mishna says, with regard to the Azazel goat it brings a kapparah for all Yidden. This is the same for non-Kohanim, Kohanim, and even for the Kohen Gadol. What is the difference between the non-Kohanim, the Kohanim, and the Kohen Gadol? It is only that the "par" brings a kapparah for the Kohanim for their entering or eating while tamei. **R' Shimon** says, just as the blood of the chatas offered inside the Heichal brings kapparah for non-Kohanim, so too the blood of the par brings kapparah for the Kohanim. Just as the "viduy" said on the goat sent to the Azazel brings kapparah for Yisrael, so too the viduy said on the par brings kapparah for the Kohanim.
 - A Braisa says, the pasuk says that the Sanhedrin should do semicha "ahl rosh hapar". **R' Yehuda** says, this teaches that the par helam davar requires semicha, but the goat brought by the tzibbur for the aveira of avoda zara does not require semicha. **R' Shimon** says, the pasuk teaches that the par helam davar requires semicha of the Sanhedrin, but the goat requires semicha of a Kohen.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the semicha of the Kohen Gadol on the Azazel goat says "hachai". **R' Yehuda** says, this teaches that this live Azazel goat requires semicha, but the goat brought for the aveira of avoda zara does not require semicha. **R' Shimon** says, the pasuk teaches that the Azazel goat requires semicha by the Kohen Gadol, and the goat brought for the aveira of avoda zara doesn't require semicha of the Kohen Gadol, but does require semicha of the Sanhedrin. This Braisa gives different sources and views than the previous Braisa!? **A: R' Sheishes** said, the first Braisa is obviously an erroneous Braisa. It says that **R' Shimon** considers the semicha of the Kohen on the goat for the aveira of avoda zara to be a true semicha. Now, that can't be, because he says that the Azazel goat is not counted as a semicha, because it is done by the Kohen instead of an owner! Rather, the Braisos should be understood as follows. **R' Yehuda** says "hapar" teaches that the par requires semicha, but the goat brought for the tzibbur's aveira of avoda zara does not. **R' Shimon** says "hachai" teaches that the Azazel goat requires semicha of the Kohen Gadol, but the goat brought for the tzibbur's aveira of avoda zara

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

does not require the Kohen Gadol's semicha, rather it requires semicha of the Sanhedrin. **R' Shimon** then said to **R' Yehuda**, the goat brought for the tzibbur's aveira of avoda zara does need semicha, and if you heard that it does not, you heard that it does not require semicha of the Kohen.

- **Q:** Why does **R' Yehuda** need a pasuk to exclude the goat brought for the tzibbur's aveira of avoda zara from semicha? **Ravina** has said that we have a kabbalah that only two tzibbur korbanos require semicha!? **A:** He used the pasuk to show his point, but it is in fact not learned from there.
- **Q:** How does **R' Shimon** know that the goat brought for the tzibbur's aveira of avoda zara requires semicha at all (the pasuk teaches that there is no semicha of the Kohen, but how does he know that there is semicha altogether)? **A:** In a Braisa he says that he learns it from an extra word "hasa'ir" written regarding the semicha requirement of the Nasi's korbon, which he says comes to include a requirement of semicha on the goat brought for the tzibbur's aveira of avoda zara, since it is similar to the Nasi's chatas in that it is brought for a known aveira.
 - **Q:** According to **Ravina** who says that there is a kabbalah that only two tzibbur korbanos require semicha, why is a pasuk needed to teach that the goat brought for the tzibbur's aveira of avoda zara needs semicha? **A:** If we only had the pasuk we would darshen a kal v'chomer to teach that the Shavuos lambs should also require semicha. We therefore need the kabbalah to teach that there are only two such tzibbur korbanos. If we only had the kabbalah, we would not know which is the second such korbon (the pasuk regarding par helam davar explicitly says that it requires semicha). We therefore need the pasuk of "hasa'ir" to teach that the second such korbon is the goat brought for the tzibbur's aveira of avoda zara.

KOL KORBANOS HAYACHID TE'UNIN SEMICHA CHUTZ MIBECHOR UMAASER UPESACH

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding a shelamim says "korbano", which comes to exclude a bechor from a semicha requirement. We would think to make a kal v'chomer – if a shelamim, which is not kadosh from birth, requires semicha, then a bechor, which is kadosh from birth, should surely need semicha! The word "korbano" teaches that it does not. Another pasuk again says "korbano", which comes to exclude a korbon maaser from a semicha requirement. We would think to make a kal v'chomer – if a shelamim, which does not have the ability to make kadosh that which comes before it or after it, requires semicha, then a korbon maaser, which does have that ability, should surely need semicha! The word "korbano" teaches that it does not. Another pasuk again says "korbano", which comes to exclude a Pesach from a semicha requirement. We would think to make a kal v'chomer – if a shelamim, which one is not obligated to bring, requires semicha, then a Pesach, which one is obligated to bring, should surely need semicha! The word "korbano" teaches that it does not.
 - **Q:** Why couldn't we refute these kal v'chomers by saying that shelamim is different in that it requires nesachim, and a tenufah of the chazeh v'shok? **A:** They could be refuted in this way. The pesukim are only an asmachta.
 - **Q:** If so, why do we need these pesukim? **A:** One "korbano" teaches that semicha cannot be done with a shaliach, one teaches that semicha is not done on the korbon of a goy, and one teaches that all the owner of a korbon must do semicha (if there were a number of partners, each of them must do semicha).

-----Daf ל"ט-----93-----

HAYOREISH SOMEICH

- **R' Chananya** taught a Braisa before **Rava** that said, an heir does not do semicha and an heir does not effect temurah. **Rava** asked, our Mishna says that a heir does do semicha and can effect temurah!? **R' Chananya** asked, should I reverse the Braisa to conform to the Mishna? **Rava** said, no. We can say that the Braisa follows the view of **R' Yehuda** of a Braisa where he argues on the **T"K** and says that an heir does not do semicha and does not effect temurah.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** What is **R' Yehuda's** reasoning? **A:** He says “korbono” comes to exclude doing semicha on one's father's korbon. He then learns the “beginning of it becoming kodesh” (i.e. temurah) from “the end of it being kodesh” (i.e. semicha) – just as an heir doesn't do semicha, an heir also can't effect temurah. The **Rabanan** say that the pasuk of “hameir yamir” teaches that an heir can effect temurah. We then learn semicha from temurah – just as an heir can effect temurah, an heir also does semicha.
 - **Q:** What do the **Rabanan** darshen on the word “korbono”? **A:** They say that one mention of “korbono” teaches that semicha is not done on the korbon of a goy, one teaches that semicha cannot be done with a shaliach, and one teaches that all the owners of a korbon must do semicha (if there were a number of partners, each of them must do semicha). **R' Yehuda** says that each partner need not do semicha, so he has one “korbono” available for his drasha. Or, even if he holds that they each must do semicha, he holds that the exclusion of doing semicha with a shaliach and doing semicha on a goy's korbon are both learned from the same “korbono”, which leaves one available for his drasha.
 - **Q:** What does **R' Yehuda** learn from the pasuk of “hameir yamir”? **A:** He says, it teaches that a woman can effect temurah. The **Rabanan** learns this from the “v'ihm” of that pasuk. **R' Yehuda** doesn't darshen the “v'ihm”.

MISHNA

- All can do semicha, except for a cheireish, shoteh, and katan, a blind man, a goy, a non-Jewish slave, a shaliach, and a woman.
- Semicha is considered to be a “shiyarei mitzvah” (a remainder of a mitzvah, meaning that it is not essential and the person has a kapparah even if the semicha was not done).
- Semicha is done on the head of the animal, using both of the person's hands. In the place that they do the semicha, they do the shechita (the animal is not moved), and the shechita is done immediately following the semicha.

GEMARA

- **Q:** A cheireish, shoteh and katan can't do semicha, because they are not considered to be legally competent. A goy can't do semicha because the pasuk says “Bnei Yisrael”. Why can't a blind person do semicha? **A: R' Chisda and R' Yitzchak bar Avdimi** answer: one said we learn this from the semicha requirement of the Sanhedrin for a par helam davar, and learn that just as a blind person cannot be a member of the Sanhedrin, he also does not do semicha; the other said we learn this from the obligation to bring an “olas re'iyah” – just as a blind person is not obligated to bring the olas re'iyah, he is also not obligated in semicha.
 - **Q:** According to the one who learns from the olas re'iyah, why did he not learn from the Sanhedrin (like the other view)? **A:** He prefers to learn the case of an individual from another case of an individual, rather than learning from the case of a tzibbur.
 - **Q:** According to the one who learns from the Sanhedrin, why did he not learn from olas re'iyah? **A:** He prefers to learn something which has the word “semicha” written regarding it from something else that has the word “semicha” written regarding it, and does not want to learn from olas re'iyah, whose semicha obligation is itself only learned from an olas nedavah.

V'HA'EVED V'HASHALIACH V'HA'ISHA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding semicha says “yado”, which teaches to exclude a slave, another pasuk again says “yado”, which teaches to exclude a shaliach, and another pasuk again says “yado”, which teaches to exclude the person's wife from doing semicha.
 - **Q:** Why do we need 3 words to exclude all these cases? **A:** If we only had one exclusionary word we would say that it excludes a slave, since he is not subject to all mitzvos, but a shaliach who is commanded in all mitzvos and we have the principle that a shaliach is like the person himself, should do semicha. If we had two pesukim to exclude these two we would say that they don't do semicha, because they are not considered to be the owner himself, but a wife, who is considered to be like the husband himself, should do semicha. That is why we need all three pesukim.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

SEMICHA SHIYAREI MITZVAH

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding olah says “v’samach...v’nirtza”, which suggests that the semicha is what brings the kapparah. Now, we know that the kapparah comes from the offering of the blood, not the semicha! Rather, the pasuk is teaching that if one is not careful with the semicha and does not do it, the pasuk considers it as if he did not get his kapparah, although he did get it to some extent.
 - A Braisa regarding tenufa says the same thing. The pasuk says “litenufa lichaper”, which suggests that the tenufa is what brings the kapparah. Now, we know that the kapparah comes from the offering of the blood, not the tenufa! Rather, the pasuk is teaching that if one is not careful with the tenufa and does not do it, the pasuk considers it as if he did not get his kapparah, although he did get it to some extent.

AHL HAROSH

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding semicha says “ahl harosh” which teaches that the hands should not be placed onto the neck. Another pasuk says “ahl harosh” again, which teaches that they should not be placed on the animal’s back. Another pasuk says “ahl harosh” again, which teaches that they should not be placed onto the animal’s breast.
 - **Q:** Why do we need all these pesukim to exclude? **A:** If we would only have one pasuk we would say that it excludes the neck, which is lower than the animal’s head, but does not exclude its back, which is at the same level as its head. If we only had two pesukim we would say that it excludes the neck and back, but does not exclude the breast, since the breast is included in the tenufa obligation. That is why we need all three pesukim to exclude these three places.
- **Q:** What is the halacha if he put his hands on the side of the head instead of on top? **A:** A Braisa says, **Abba Bira’ah the son of R’ Eliezer ben Yaakov** said, the hands must be on top of the head, not on the sides of the head.
- **Q:** **R’ Yirmiya** asked, what is the halacha if someone wrapped his hands in a cloth when doing the semicha? Would that be a problem of chatzitza? **A:** A Braisa says that there may not be a chatzitza between his hands and the animal.

UBISHTEI YADAYIM

- **Q:** How do we know this? **A:** **Reish Lakish** said, the pasuk regarding the semicha on the Azazel goat says “shtei yadav” – it is written as “yado” (singular) but read as “yadav” (plural), and says “shtei” – two. This teaches that whenever it says “yado” it refers to two hands unless the Torah specifically says it is referring to one hand.
 - **R’ Elazar** once repeated this without saying that it was **Reish Lakish** who said this. **Reish Lakish** became upset and asked, if this is true, why do we have so many examples of the Torah writing the word “yadav” – spelled in the plural!? **R’ Elazar** remained silent. When **Reish Lakish** calmed down he said, I was referring to the word “yado” written regarding semicha. **R’ Elazar** asked, regarding the semicha of Moshe on Yehoshua the pasuk says “yadav”!? **Reish Lakish** said, I was referring to semicha done on an animal.

UBIMAKOM SHESOMCHIN SHOCHATIN TEIKEF LISEMICHA SHECHITA

- **Q:** If the shechita must be immediately following the semicha, it is obvious that it must be done in the same place (if it is moved it will not be done immediately after)!? **A:** The Mishna means that the shechita must take place in the same spot as the semicha *because* the shechita must be done immediately following the semicha.

-----Daf 73-----94-----

MISHNA

- There is a chumra in semicha over tenufa, and a chumra in tenufa over semicha. The chumra of semicha is that one person cannot do semicha on behalf of all the partners of a korbon, but one person can do the tenufa on behalf of all the partners. The chumra of tenufa is that tenufa is done to korbanos of individuals and of the tzibbur, when the animal is alive and after it is shechted, and with living items and nonliving items, whereas semicha is not.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, the word “korbono” comes to teach that all owners of a korbon must do the semicha. We would make a kal v’chomer to say differently. We would say, if tenufa which is even done to an animal that was shechted, is done by only one of the partners, then semicha, which is not done to shechted animals, should certainly be done by just one of the partners. The pasuk of “korbono” teaches that all the partners must do semicha.
 - **Q:** We should say that tenufa must be done by all the partners, based on a kal v’chomer – if semicha, which is not done to shechted animals, must be done by all the partners, then tenufa, which is done to shechted animals should certainly be done by all the partners!? **A:** It is not possible to have all the partners do a tenufa. If they do it together, each one acts as a chatzita to the other. They can’t each do a separate tenufa, because the pasuk says “tenufa”, which means there is to be only one tenufa, not multiple tenuous.
- **Q:** Is there no semicha that is done to a shechted animal? A Mishna says that the Kohen Gadol would lean on the cut up pieces of the korbon before throwing them onto the fire!? **A:** That was done to honor the Kohen Gadol, not as an obligatory semicha.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK SHTEI MIDDOS!!!

PEREK SHTEI HALECHEM -- PEREK ACHAD ASSAR

MISHNA

- The Shte Halechem are kneaded one by one and are baked one by one.
- The Lechem Hapanim are kneaded one by one and are baked two by two. They would be made in a mold. When they would be removed from the oven they would be put into another mold so that they not become ruined and broken.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that these breads were kneaded one by one? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the Lechem Hapanim says “shnei esronim yihiyeh hachalah ha’echas” – this teaches that each loaf is made one by one. The extra word of “yihiyeh” teaches that the same is to be done for the Shte Halechem. How do we know that the Lechem Hapanim are baked two by two? The pasuk says “v’samta osam”, using the plural form. The word “osam” is also exclusionary and teaches that this is not done for the Shte Halechem.
 - **Q:** The word “osam” was used for a drasha, so how can it then be used to exclude the Shte Halechem as well? **A:** The pasuk could have said “v’samtam” and instead says “v’samta osam”, which therefore allows for two drashos.
- A Braisa says, “v’samta osam” teaches that the Lechem Hapanim are put into a mold. There were three molds there. When the loaf was still dough it would be put into one mold. It was then put into something like a mold in the oven. When it was removed from the oven it was then put into another mold so that it would not become ruined.
 - **Q:** Why didn’t they put it back into the first mold? **A:** When they were baked they became bigger and therefore needed a larger mold.
- **Q:** How was the Lechem Hapanim shaped? **A:** **R’ Chanina** said it was shaped like an open box (a bottom with two walls and no top). **R’ Yochanan** said it was shaped like a fast ship (oval shaped with ends that come to a point like a “v”).
 - **Q:** According to **R’ Chanina** it makes sense that the spoons of levonah were put at the bottom of the “box”, but according to **R’ Yochanan**, where were the spoons placed? **A:** They would make a place for them in the walls of the loaf.
 - **Q:** According to **R’ Chanina** it makes sense that there were rods that rested on the loaves (to create a separation between the loaf and the loaf that rested on top of it), but according to **R’ Yochanan** where were the rods placed? **A:** They would put extra pieces of dough at the ends of the loaf to hold the rods.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** According to **R' Chanina** it makes sense that there were “snifin” (like poles that supported the loaves) because they were box shape, but according to **R' Yochanan** how did these support the loaves? **A:** These snifin were made in a semicircle shape which were able to support the loaves.
- **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan** it makes sense why the snifin were even needed (the loaves were shaped like a boat without a flat bottom), but according to **R' Chanina** why were they needed? **A:** The weight of the stack of loaves could make the lower ones break if there was no support from the snifin.
- **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan** it makes sense that the snifin were on the Shulchan, because the shape of the loaves allowed for space on the Shulchan, but according to **R' Chanina** the loaves took up all the space on the Shulchan, so where were the snifin put? Were they put on the ground!? **A:** Yes, in fact according to **R' Chanina** they were placed on the ground, as we find **R' Abba bar Mamal** to have said as well.
- **Q:** **R' Yehuda** said that the loaves supported the snifin and the snifin supported the breads. Which view does that follow? **A:** It follows the view of **R' Yochanan**, because according to him the shape of the loaf would be supported by the snifin but would also give support to the snifin, which were made to fit snugly around the ship-shaped loaves.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that there was a basket in the oven (which was the mold) and it was the shape of a square tablet. This is problematic according to the view of **R' Yochanan**!? **A:** Amend the Braisa to say that at the top it was that shape, but on the bottom it was the shape of a fast moving ship.
- There is a Braisa that supports **R' Yochanan** and explicitly says that the loaves were shaped like a fast moving ship.

-----Daf 95-----

- **Q:** Did the Lechem Hapanim become passul when the Mishkan was travelling in the Midbar (with the psul of yotzeh)? **A:** **R' Yochanan and R' Yehoshua ben Levi** argue: one says they did become passul and the other says that they did not. The one who holds it became passul darshens the pasuk of “kasher yachanu kein yisa'u”, which teaches that just as when they were not traveling it would become passul with yotzeh (if it left the Azarah) so too during traveling it became passul with yotzeh. The one who holds it did not become passul darshens the pasuk of “v'lechem hatamid alav yihiyeh”, which teaches that during the travelling the Lechem Hapanim remained valid on the Shulchan.
 - **Q:** What does the view that it did not become passul do with the pasuk of “kasher yachanu...”? **A:** He darshens it to teach that just as when they weren't travelling, if it did not leave the Shulchan it did not become passul, so too when they were travelling, if it did not leave the Shulchan it did not become passul.
 - **Q:** What does the view that it did become passul do with the pasuk of “v'lechem hatamid...”? **A:** Rather, **R' Dimi** said that all agree that Lechem Hapanim that was on the Shulchan would not become passul during travelling. The machlokes is regarding Lechem Hapanim that were removed from the Shulchan and were carried along with the other keilim. The one who holds it became passul says that “kasher yachanu...” teaches that just as when they were not travelling it would become passul if it left the Azarah, it becomes passul now as well (since it left the Azarah, and in fact there is no Azarah). The one who says it would not become passul holds that the pasuk of “v'nasah Ohel Moed” teaches that even when it was taken apart and was travelling, the area in which it was carried (the Machaneh Levi'im) had the status of the Ohel Moed and the Lechem Hapanim were not considered to have ever left the Ohel Moed.
 - **Q:** What does the view that it did not become passul do with the pasuk of “kasher yachanu...”? **A:** He darshens it to teach that just as when they weren't travelling, if it did not leave the Azarah it did not become passul, so too when they were travelling, if it did not leave the Machaneh Levi'im it did not become passul.
 - **Q:** What does the view that it did become passul do with the pasuk of “v'nasah Ohel Moed”? **A:** He says this pasuk only teaches the placement of the Mishkan while the Yidden travelled. The other view learns this from the pasuk of “Machaneh Halevi'im b'toch hamachanos”.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa says that when the Mishkan was taken apart for travel all the kodashim became passul with yotzeh and all the metzoras and zavim were sent out of the machanos. This refutes the view that the Lechem Hapanim did not become passul!? **A:** This refers to all kodashim other than the Lechem Hapanim.
 - **Q:** If the pasuk of “v’nasah Ohel Moed” teaches that the area retains its status as the Ohel Moed even during travel, then all kodashim should remain valid, and if it does not retain its status, then even the Lechem Hapanim should become passul!? **A:** Rather, **Ravin** said the two views are not arguing at all. The view that said it was not passul was talking about Lechem Hapanim that remained on the Shulchan, and the view that said it becomes passul was referring to Lechem Hapanim that was taken off the Shulchan.
 - **Abaye** said, we can learn from this Braisa that the Mishkan was even taken apart at night (and if Hashem said to begin travelling they would not wait for morning before taking the Mishkan apart), because if they would wait for morning, the kodashim would not become passul for yotzeh, because they would already be passul for linah.
 - **Q:** This seems obvious, as the pasuk says “laleches yomam valuyla”!? **A:** We would think that the travelling could begin at night only when the Mishkan was taken apart during the day. **Abaye** therefore teaches that the Mishkan may even be taken apart at night.
 - **Q:** Another Braisa says that when the curtains around the Azarah were rolled up the metzoras and zavim were allowed to enter that area. This contradicts the earlier Braisa that says they were sent out of the machanos!? **A:** **R’ Ashi** said, this second Braisa follows the view of **R’ Eliezer** and the earlier Braisa follows the view of the **Rabanan**.

MISHNA

- The Shte Halechem and the Lechem Hapanim may be kneaded and shaped outside the Azarah, but they must be baked in the Azarah. The baking does not override Shabbos. **R’ Yehuda** says, all the preparations must be done inside the Azarah. **R’ Shimon** says, one should always be accustomed to say that the preparations of the Shte Halechem and Lechem Hapanim are valid in the Azarah and are valid in the Beis Pagi (meaning, they are valid throughout Yerushalayim, even with regard to their baking).

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna says that the kneading and shaping may be done outside the Azarah, which implies that the solid measuring keilim are not kodesh (and therefore don’t make the flour kodesh). The Mishna then says that they must be baked in the Azarah, which suggests that the solid measures (the oven) is kodesh!? **Rava** said, **R’ Sheishes** found this question to be a very difficult one.
 - **Q:** Why can’t we simply answer that the measures weren’t made kodesh but that the oven was!? **A:** The question that he found difficult was as follows. The Mishna says that the baking had to be done in the Azarah, which means that the oven was kodesh. The Mishna then says that they could not be baked on Shabbos. If so, they should become passul with linah for having been left over Friday night!? It was this question to which **Rava** said, **R’ Sheishes** found this question to be a very difficult one.
 - **R’ Ashi** asked, why can’t we say that the Mishna doesn’t mean that the baking must take place in the Azarah, rather it means that it must be done by the Kohanim?
 - The Gemara says, this statement of **R’ Ashi** is a mistake, because if baking must be done by the Kohanim then the kneading and shaping must also be done by them, and if the kneading and shaping need not be done by them, the baking should not need to be done by them either!?

R’ YEHUDA OMER KOL MAASEYHEN BIFNIM...

- **R’ Avahu bar Kahana** said, **R’ Yehuda** and **R’ Shimon** both darshen the same pasuk. The pasuk discusses the Lechem Hapanim and says “v’hu derech chol v’ahf ki hayom yikdash bakeli”. **R’ Yehuda** said, the pasuk means

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

that Dovid saw the Kohanim baking the Lechem Hapanim on Friday and asked that since it will become kadosh in the oven it will become passul with linah overnight!? **R' Shimon** said, the pasuk means that Dovid saw them baking it on Shabbos and asked, shouldn't this have been baked on Friday – do you think that the oven is kodesh and will therefore make the breads become passul with linah!? It is the Shulchan that makes the breads kadosh!

- **Q:** How can we say that Dovid saw the Kohanim when they were baking the breads? From the other pesukim we see that he came when the old breads were already removed from the Shulchan and the new breads were already placed on the Shulchan!? Rather, the pasuk means that Dovid told them, not only may you give me to eat from the breads that were removed, but you can even give me to eat from the breads that are on the Shulchan, because he was in a state of *sakanas nefashos*. If so, what is the basis of the machlokes for **R' Yehuda and R' Shimon**? **A:** They argue based on a kabbalah of whether the oven makes the breads kodesh. In fact, the words of **R' Shimon** in the Mishna – “a person should be accustomed to say...” – suggests that this is based on a kabbalah that he had. SHEMAH MINAH.

-----Daf 96-----

MISHNA

- With regard to the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol, their kneading, shaping, and baking must be done in the Azarah, and they override Shabbos. However, the grinding and the sifting do not override Shabbos.
 - **R' Akiva** said a rule: any melacha that can be done before Shabbos does not override Shabbos, and any melacha that cannot be done before Shabbos does override Shabbos.
- With regard to all other menachos, the kneading and the shaping must be done in a keili shareis inside the Azarah, and may not be done in a keili outside the Azarah.
- The Shteil Halechem were 7 tefachim in length and 4 tefachim wide, with their horns being 4 etzba'os in length. The Lechem Hapanim were 10 tefachim in length and 5 tefachim wide, with their horns being 7 etzba'os in length. **R' Yehuda** says, that a way to remember these dimensions is with the two acronyms of “zadad” and “yehaz”.
- **Ben Zomah** says, the pasuk says “v'nasata ahl haShulchan lechem panim lifanai tamid”. The words “lechem panim” teach that the breads must have “faces” (walls – Rashi).
 - **R' Yehuda** says, the Shulchan was 10 tefachim long and 5 tefachim wide. The Lechem Hapanim were also 10 tefachim long and 5 tefachim wide. The length of the bread would be put across the width of the Shulchan, and he would bend up 2.5 tefachim of each side of the bread, leaving a base of 5 tefachim which would completely fill the width of the Shulchan. **R' Meir** says, the Shulchan was 12 tefachim long and 6 tefachim wide. The Lechem Hapanim were 10 tefachim long and 5 tefachim wide. The length of the bread would be put across the width of the Shulchan, and he would bend up 2 tefachim of each side of the bread, leaving a base of 6 tefachim. He would leave 2 tefachim of space between the breads on the Shulchan to allow for circulation of air.
 - **Abba Shaul** says, they would put the spoons of levonah in those 2 tefachim of empty space between the breads. They said to him, the pasuk says that the levonah was put “ahl hama'areches”, which means that the levonah was put onto the breads, not on the Shulchan next to the breads! He said to them, the pasuk regarding Shevet Menasheh says “v'alav matei Menasheh”, which means that they were *next to* Shevet Efraim, not *on* them! The pasuk regarding the levonah can be explained in the same way.
 - There were 4 supports made of gold, with things sticking out on the upper part of them with which the Kohanim would support the breads – 2 supports for one arrangement and 2 supports for the other arrangement. There were 28 rods that were like hollow reeds opened in half – 14 used for one arrangement and 14 for the other.
 - The arranging of the rods and the removal of the rods do not override Shabbos. Rather, the Kohen would go into the Heichal on Friday and would remove the rods, placing them along the length of the Shulchan (so that he would not have to remove them on Shabbos).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- All the keilim that were in the Beis Hamikdash were placed so that their length followed the length of the Beis Hamikdash.

GEMARA

- They asked **Rebbi**, how do we know that with regard to all other menachos, the kneading and the shaping must be done in a keili shareis inside the Azarah? He said, the pasuk says that the Malach showed Yechezkel the place that the chatas, asham, and mincha are to be made. This creates a comparison which teaches that just as a chatas and asham must be cooked in a keili, so too a mincha must be kneaded and shaped in a keili.

HASHULCHAN ARKO ASARA

- **R' Yochanan** said, according to the view that the sides of the loaves were bent up 2.5 tefachim, it comes out that the Shulchan makes things kodesh up to a height of 15 tefachim above the Shulchan. According to the view that the sides were bent up 2 tefachim, it comes out that it makes kodesh up to a height of 12 tefachim.
 - **Q:** There are also the rods, which add height beyond that of the loaves alone!? **A:** The rods were sunken into the loaves and didn't take up any extra space.
 - **Q:** The whole point of the rods is to make space for air between the breads, if they were sunken in there is no space!? **A:** The Kohen raises them a drop.
 - **Q:** If so there is that extra amount of space above the Shulchan that it makes kodesh!? **A:** Since it is less than a tefach **R' Yochanan** did not count it.
 - **Q:** There are the spoons of levonah that are on the breads, that also add height!? **A:** They were placed inside the breads and didn't need height beyond that provided by the breads.
 - **Q:** There are the horns that add to the height!? **A:** They were folded into the breads, and therefore did not need any additional height.
 - **Q:** There is the "misgeres" (the frame around the end of the Shulchan) that was a tefach high and therefore added height!? **A:** **R' Yochanan** follows the view that the misgeres was made below the top of the Shulchan, and therefore it did not add height from the top of the Shulchan. Even according to the view that it was above the Shulchan's top, it was placed as a frame outside of the top, not on it, and therefore it did not add any height to it. The breads did not sit on it, but were instead enclosed in by it, as we find **R' Yose** says in a Braisa.
 - **R' Yochanan** said, according to the view that the misgeres was below the top of the Shulchan we can learn that a flat piece of wood (with no receptacle) can become tamei (because the top of the Shulchan had no receptacle and yet it could become tamei). According to the view that the misgeres was above the top of the Shulchan (which therefore created a receptacle) we would still have the question of whether a flat piece of wood could become tamei.
 - **Q:** This implies that the Shulchan could become tamei. Why is that so? It is a piece of wood that is meant to stay permanently in place, and such a piece of wood is not mekabel tumah!? **A:** The Shulchan was moved from its place, like **Reish Lakish** says that it was brought out to be shown to the Yidden on Yom Tov so that they see how beloved they are to Hashem, as **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said that the bread remained warm from when it was placed on the Shulchan until it was taken off (a week later).
 - **Q:** The Shulchan would become tamei even if it was permanently in place, never to be moved, because it is plated with gold (a metal)!? You can't say that this is only true where the plating is nailed down to the wood, because we have learned that the plating gives it the status of a metal keili even if the plating is not permanently affixed to the wood with nails or the like! Also, even though **Reish Lakish** says that that is only true for ordinary wood plated with metal, but not for expensive wood (which is what the Shulchan was made of), **R' Yochanan** says that it is true even for expensive wood covered with metal! **A:** A pasuk refers to the Shulchan as "wood". Therefore, it retains its status as a wooden keili (which only becomes tamei if it is meant to be moved even when full).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The pasuk just referenced refers to the Shulchan first as a mizbe'ach, and then as a table. **R' Yochanan** and **Reish Lakish** both said, this teaches that when the Beis Hamikdash stood, the Mizbe'ach provided kaparah. Now, after the Churban, a person's table provides the kaparah (by inviting guests to join his meal).