



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Menachos, Daf טז – Daf לז

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 טז---97-----

ARBAH SENIFIN SHEL ZAHAV HAYU SHAM...

- **Q:** How do we know that the Shulchan had snifin and rods? **A:** **R' Ketina** said, the pasuk regarding the Shulchan says that they should make “ke’arosav” – referring to the molds, “kaposav” – referring to the spoons for the levonah, “kisosav” – referring to the snifin, and “menakiyosav” – referring to the rods, “asher yusach bahein” – teaches that the rods covered the loaves that were beneath them.
  - **Q:** **Rava** asked, our Mishna said that the setting up and removal of the rods do not override Shabbos. If the rods are required D’Oraisa, why does it not override Shabbos? **A:** **Rava** then said, this is not a question, as our Mishna says that **R' Akiva** said that anything that can be done before Shabbos does not override Shabbos. The only need for the rods is so that the breads have air circulation and don’t become moldy. There is no risk of them becoming moldy during the short time until Shabbos is over.
- A Mishna says, **R' Meir** says all amos of the Beis Hamikdash (whether of structures or of keilim) were made of “medium amos” (6 tefachim), except for the Golden Mizbe’ach and the horns, the ledge, and the base of the outside Mizbe’ach, which were amos of 5 tefachim. **R' Yehuda** says the amos of the structures were of 6 tefachim but the amos used for the keilim were of 5 tefachim.
  - **R' Yochanan** said, both views are based on a drasha of the same pasuk. The pasuk discusses the dimensions of the outside Mizbe’ach and says that it was made of amos of 6 tefachim, the base was a 5 tefach amah, the width (the ledge) is also a 5 tefach amah, and the border to the edge (the horns) is one half amah, “and this (the 5 tefach amah) is the top of the Mizbe’ach” – refers to the Golden Mizbe’ach. **R' Meir** says the pasuk teaches that it is only the Golden Mizbe’ach that uses the amah of 5 tefachim for all its measurements, but everything else uses 6 tefachim amos. **R' Yehuda** says the pasuk teaches that all the keilim should be of 5 tefach amos like the Golden Mizbe’ach.
    - One could think to say that the measurements in the pasuk refer to the height, and the pasuk is saying that the vertical measure of the Mizbe’ach up to the ledge is in amos of 5 tefachim. However, this cannot be correct for the following reason. We know the Mizbe’ach was 10 amos tall. If this understanding of the pasuk is correct, it would mean that there were 6 amos of 5 tefachim and 4 amos of 6 tefachim, for a total height of 54 tefachim. That would mean that the midpoint of the Mizbe’ach was at 27 tefachim high. The distance from the horns to the ledge was 24 tefachim, which means that the midpoint was 3 tefachim below the ledge. Now, a Braisa says that when one is on the ledge with a bird olah (whose blood must be squeezed onto the upper half of the Mizbe’ach wall), he can even squeeze it up to one amah below where he is standing. Now, based on the calculation he would be putting it on the lower half of the Mizbe’ach, so how can that be valid!? Rather, the pasuk means that the indenting of the base is an amah of 5 tefachim, the same is for the indenting of the ledge and for the indenting (width) of the horns (but all height measurements were in amos of 6 tefachim). Based on this, the Mizbe’ach was 60 tefachim high, which means the midpoint was at 30 tefachim. The distance from the horns to the ledge was 24 tefachim, which means that the midpoint was 6 tefachim below the ledge. Based on this, if he squeezed the blood up to an amah below the ledge it would still be valid, as the Braisa says.
      - **Q:** We can’t say that it refers to the indenting, for the following reason. A Mishna says that the Mizbe’ach was 32x32 amos. It then rose one amah (for the base and indented inward an amah of the base, making the Mizbe’ach at this height to have the dimensions of 30x30 amos. Now, if the indenting was only of 5 tefachim (as was just posited), then the dimensions at that point was actually 30 amos and 2 tefachim by 30

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

amos and 2 tefachim!? Further, the Mishna says that 5 amos higher there was another indenting for the ledge, creating the dimensions at that height of 28x28. Again, if the indenting was only of 5 tefachim (as was just posited), then the dimensions at that point was actually 28 amos and 4 tefachim by 28 amos and 4 tefachim!? You can't say that the Tanna doesn't mention the extra tefachim because they are less than an additional complete amah, because the Mishna does the same at the top of the Mizbe'ach, and at that point we have an additional 2 tefachim (2 tefachim from each indenting) for a total of an additional amah!? **A:** The Mishna is not precise with its measurement, but in truth there was an additional amah at that level on top of the Mizbe'ach.

- **Q:** The Mishna then says that the place of the fire was 24x24 amos. However, based on what was posited above, it was actually 25x25 amos!? You can't say that the Mishna was not precise about this either, because we learn from a pasuk that the place of the fire was only 24x24 amos!? You also can't say that six of the amos of the dimension of the Mizbe'ach are measured with amos of 5 tefachim, because that would mean that the Mizbe'ach took up less room in the Azarah, and there is a Mishna which accounts for every amah of space in the Azarah, and would have accounted for this additional space if some of the amos of the Mizbe'ach were of 5 tefachim!? **A:** Rather, the pasuk must be understood to mean that the height of the base was an amah of 5 tefachim, but with regard to the ledge it was the indentation that was an amah of 5 tefachim, and the height of the horns that was measured based on an amah of 5 tefachim. Based on this, the Mizbe'ach was 58 tefachim tall, which means its midpoint was at 29 tefachim. From the horns to the ledge was a distance of 23 tefachim, which leaves 6 tefachim to the midpoint, which is why the Mishna allows for the blood of the olah bird to be squeezed up to an amah below the ledge.

### -----Daf פ"ט-----98-----

- **Q:** How many tefachim are in a "medium amah"? **A: R' Yochanan** said it is 6 tefachim.
  - **R' Yose bar Avin** said, we can see this from our Mishna as well, because **R' Meir** says that medium amos were used for the keilim and also says that the Shulchan was 12x6 tefachim (the pasuk says it was 2 amos by 1 amah). We see from here that a medium amah is 6 tefachim.
  - **Q:** This suggests that there are amos that are larger than 6 tefachim? **A:** In fact there were. A Mishna says that in the chamber in the Mikdash known as the "Shushan Habirah" there were two amah measuring sticks – one larger than the 6 tefach amah of Moshe by one half etzbah and one larger than the amah of Moshe by one full etzbah. The purpose of these was so that people who sold or made things for the Mikdash would have to deliver based on these larger measurements although they would only get paid based on the smaller measurement.
    - **Q:** Why was the chamber known as the Shushan Habirah, and why did it have a picture of Shushan on it? **A: R' Chisda and R' Yitzchak bar Avdimi** gave explanations – one said it was to remind all that we were in galus in Paras and to remind them to give thanks to that kingdom, and the other says it was to instill the fear of the kingdom.
      - **R' Yannai** said, one should always fear the kingdom, as we see that even Moshe spoke with respect to Pharaoh. **R' Yochanan** said we see it from Eliyahu in the way that he showed respect for King Achav (although he was a rasha).
    - A pasuk teaches that there will be trees that will grow from the banks of the river that will flow from the Kodsh Hakodashim. The pasuk says that the leaves will have healing powers. **R' Yitzchak bar Avdimi and R' Chisda** argue as to what the healing powers were. One says it cured mutes to be able to speak, and the other says it cured a woman who couldn't have children. We also find the **Chizkiya** said like the first understanding and **Bar Kappara** said like the second.
- A Braisa says, if the pasuk would have said to make 12 loaves and put them into two arrangements, we would have said that we can make one arrangement of 8 loaves and one of 4. That is why the pasuk says that there

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

should be 6 to each arrangement. If the pasuk would have said to make “2 arrangements, 6 to the arrangement” and did not say that there should be a total of 12 loaves, we would have said that there should be 3 arrangements of 6 each. The pasuk therefore says there should be 12 loaves. If the pasuk would have only said “12 loaves” and “arrangements” and “arrangement”, without mentioning “2” or “6”, we would have said that there are to be 3 arrangements of 4 loaves each. Therefore the pasuk says “2 arrangements” and “6 in the arrangement”. It comes out, that without all these words we would not know the proper number of loaves or arrangements. What is the proper way to arrange the loaves? There are 2 arrangements of 6 loaves in each. If he put 4 in one and 8 in the other, he is not yotzeh. If he made two arrangements with 7 loaves in each, **Rebbi** says we view the top loaf as if it does not exist, and he is therefore yotzeh.

- **Q:** The pasuk says that the spoons of levonah must be on the loaves (“ahl”), so if it is put on the 7<sup>th</sup> loaf how is he yotzeh? The levonah is not on the loaves!? **A: R’ Chisda** said to **R’ Hamnuna**, **Rebbi** follows his view of elsewhere, where he says that “ahl” means “next to”. Therefore, placing it on the 7<sup>th</sup> loaf is valid as well.

### KOL HAKEILIM SHEBAMIKDASH...

- A Braisa says, all the keilim in the Mikdash were placed so that their length was placed to the length of the Mikdash, except for the Aron, whose length was to the width of the Midkash, and that is how it was placed and that is how its poles were placed.
  - **Q:** What does the Braisa mean in the last statement? **A:** It means that it was placed with its length to the width of the Mikdash because its poles had to have their length to the length of the Midkash. We learn this from a Braisa which says that they would poke out into the Paroches.
    - **Q:** This assumes that the poles were placed along the width of the Aron. How do we know that that is how it was done? **A: R’ Yehuda** said, we learn from pesukim that when the Aron was carried it would be carried by two people on each side. If two people fit, it must be that the poles were along its width (which meant the people fit along the Aron’s length).
- A Braisa says, we learn from a pasuk that Shlomo made 10 Shulchanos for the Beis Hamikdash in addition to the one that Moshe made, and the pasuk says that 5 were placed on the right and 5 on the left. This can’t mean to the right and left of the entrance, because that would mean that some would be on the south side of the Heichal, which would violate the requirement that the Shulchan had to be in the north. Rather, it means that the Shulchan of Moshe was in the center, and from the Shulchanos of Shlomo, 5 were to its right and 5 were to its left.
  - A Braisa says, we learn from a pasuk that Shlomo made 10 Menoros for the Beis Hamikdash in addition to the one that Moshe made, and the pasuk says that 5 were placed on the right and 5 on the left. This can’t mean to the right and left of the entrance, because that would mean that some would be on the north side of the Heichal, which would violate the requirement that the the Menorah had to be in the south. Rather, it means that the Menorah of Moshe was in the center, and from the Menoros of Shlomo, 5 were to its right and 5 were to its left.
  - One Braisa says that the Shulchanos were placed from the midpoint of the Beis Hamikdash and westward and another Braisa says they were placed from 1/3 of the Beis Hamikdash and westward. These are not contradictory. The second Braisa is including the Kodshei HaKodashim as part of the Beis Hamikdash for this purpose, and therefore it was from 1/3 of the way into the Beis Hamikdash (which is the same point as the midpoint of the Beis Hamikdash without taking into account the Kodshei HaKodashim), and the first Braisa is not including the Kodshei HaKodashim as part of the Beis Hamikdash.
  - A Braisa says, **Rebbi** said the Shulchanos were put lengthwise from east to west. **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Shimon** said it was put from north to south.
    - **Rebbi** learns this from the Menorah – just as the Menorah was put east to west, so too the Shulchanos were put east to west. He says that Menorah was put east to west based on a pasuk that says that the western flame was lit “lifnei Hashem”, which means that it was closer to the Kodesh HaKodashim than any of the other flames, because it was the most to west (which means that the Menorah was placed east to west). **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Shimon** learns his

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

view from the Aron – just as the Aron was put from north to south, so too the Shulchanos were put north to south.

- **Rebbi** rather learn from the Menorah, because that would be learning a keili from outside the Kodesh HaKodashim (the Shulchan) from another keili outside the Kodesh HaKodashim (the Menorah). **R' Elazar** says that the Menorah itself was put from north to south. He explains the pasuk of "lifnei Hashem" to mean that all the wicks faced the center, as is taught by a Braisa, and the center wick faced to the Kodesh Hakodashim, and that is what is referred to as "lifnei Hashem".
- **Q:** According to **Rebbi** we can understand how the Shulchanos were set up in the east to west space of 20 amos (there were 10 Shulchanos, with each being 2 amos long, and the midpoint of the Heichal was at 20 amos, therefore, even with a drop of room between each Shulchan it was at most a small piece of the last Shulchan that was beyond the midpoint of the Heichal). However, according to **R' Elazar**, how did the 10 Shulchanos fit in the exact space of 20 amos from north to south (there was not even a drop of extra room for the small space that would necessarily be between Shulchanos)!? Further, even if the Shulchanos could fit in the 20 amos from north to south, how would the Kohanim be able to get past this line of Shulchanos!? Further, this would mean that there were 5 Shulchanos in the south of the Heichal!? Further, where was the Shulchan of Moshe put!? **A:** This last question applies according to **Rebbi** as well. Rather, we must say that the Shulchanos were put into two parallel rows of 5 each, with the Shulchan of Moshe in between these parallel rows.
  - **Q:** This makes sense according to **R' Elazar**, for now all fit in the north half of the Heichal and in the western half of the Heichal. However, according to **Rebbi**, since they needed to be pulled away 2.5 amos from the north wall, and needed an amah for the width of the Shulchan itself, and another 2.5 amos of space between this row and the Shulchan of Moshe, and an amah for that Shulchan, and then another 2.5 amos between it and the second row, and an amah for the width of that row, this setup required a width of 10.5 amos, which meant that it went ½ amah into the south side of the Heichal!? **A:** The Shulchan of Moshe was not put in between the rows. Rather, it was put to the west of the rows (and there was no need for 2.5 amos between it and the rows). Therefore, all the other Shulchanos fit comfortably in the northwest quadrant of the Heichal.

### -----Daf ט"ט-----99-----

- A Braisa says, Shlomo made 10 Shulchanos, but they only set up Lechem Hapanim on the Shulchan of Moshe, as the pasuk says "v'es haShulchan asher alav Lechem Hapanim" – stated in the singular. Shlomo made 10 Menoros, but the Kohanim would only light the Menorah of Moshe, as the pasuk says "Menoras hazahav..." – stated in the singular. **R' Elazar ben Shamu'ah** said, all the Shulchanos were set with Lechem Hapanim, as the pasuk says "es haShulchanos va'aleyhem Lechem Hapanim" – in the plural, and all the Menoros were lit, as the pasuk says "es haMenoros...", written in the plural. **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** explains that the **T"K** will say that the pasuk brought by **R' Elazar** regarding the Shulchanos refers to the 3 tables that were in the Beis Hamikdash – 2 on the inside of the Ulam, one of silver on which the loaves were put as they were being brought in and one of gold on which the loaves were put as they were being taken out, because we only go higher in matters of kodesh and never go lower, and the third table was the Shulchan on which the loaves were set up for the week.
  - **Rebbi** says, we learn from a pasuk that we may not go lower in matters of kodesh. The pasuk says that only Moshe put up the Mishkan, without others helping him. This is because once he began putting it up he did not allow others who were not as great as him to do so.
  - **R' Acha bar Yaakov** says that we learn from a pasuk that we may go higher in matters of kodesh. The pasuk says the metal of the shovels used by korach's people was then used to plate the Mizbe'ach.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yosef** taught a Braisa that says that the pasuk of “*asher shibarta*” teaches that the Luchos, as well as the broken pieces of the first Luchos, were put into the Aron. From here we learn that if a talmid chochom forgot his learning because of an oneis, he should not be treated in a demeaning manner.
  - **Reish Lakish** said, “*asher shibarta*” means that Hashem thanked Moshe for breaking the Luchos. We learn from here that sometimes the stopping of Torah is the fulfillment of the Torah.
  - **Reish Lakish** said, we learn from a pasuk that if a talmid chochom sins, we should not demean him publicly, rather we should try to conceal the sin.
  - **Reish Lakish** darshens a pasuk to teach, whoever forgets even one thing of his Torah learning is oiver a lav. **Ravina** darshens that he is oiver two lavim. **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** darshens that he is oiver 3 lavim.
    - However, this does not apply if he forgot due to an oneis. **R' Dustai the son of R' Yannai** said, that forgetting because he has learned too much to remember is also treated as an oneis.
  - **R' Yochanan and R' Elazar** said, Torah was given in 40 days and a neshama is created in 40 days. This teaches that one who guards his Torah will have his neshama guarded.

### MISHNA

- There were 2 Shulchanos on the inside of the Ulam near the door to the Beis Hamikdash – one of marble and one of gold. The Kohanim would put the incoming Lechem Hapanim on the marble table when bringing them into the Beis Hamikdash to be set up. They would put the outgoing Lechem Hapanim on the gold table as they were carrying them out of the Beis Hamikdash. This is because, in matters of kedusha we only go higher, not lower.
- There was a golden table (“The Shulchan”) inside the heichal, on which the Lechem Hapanim was arranged at all times.
  - Four Kohanim would enter (to switch out the breads) – 2 held the 2 arrangements and 2 held the 2 spoons filled with levonah. Four other Kohanim would enter before them – 2 to take the two arrangements and 2 to take the two spoons of levonah. The ones bringing in the breads and levonah would stand to the north of the Shulchan, facing south. The ones who came to remove the breads and levonah would stand to the south of the Shulchan, facing north. As the Kohanim are pulling out the old breads, the other Kohanim are pushing in the new breads, with each tefach of removal of the old breads being taken over with a tefach of the new breads, to fulfil the pasuk of “*lefanai tamid*” (continuously). **R' Yose** says, even if the Kohanim fully remove the old breads and only then are the new breads placed on the Shulchan, that would still fulfil the pasuk of “*lefanai tamid*”.
  - The Kohanim with the old breads would leave the Heichal and put the breads on the golden table in the Ulam. They would then burn the levonah on the Mizbe'ach and the breads would then be divided among the Kohanim.
    - If Yom Kippur fell out on Shabbos, the breads would not be divided until the evening.
      - If Yom Kippur fell out on a Friday, the mussaf of Yom Kippur would be eaten that evening (on Shabbos), by people of Bavel who had no problem eating raw meat.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R' Yose** says, even if the old breads were removed in the morning and the new breads were not placed on the Shulchan until the evening, it is not a problem. How are we to understand “*lefanai tamid*”? It means that the Shulchan may not be left without breads over a night.
  - **R' Ami** said, we can learn from this, that even if someone only learns one perek of Torah in the morning and one perek in the evening, he has fulfilled the requirement of “*lo yamush Sefer HaTorah hazeh mipicha*”.
    - **R' Yochanan in the name of R' Shimon ben Yochai** said, even if someone only reads kriyas shema in the morning and the evening, he has fulfilled the requirement of “*lo yamush*”.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

However, it is assur to tell this to an ahm haaretz. **Rava** said, it is a mitzvah to tell this to an ahm haaretz (he holds it will cause him to learn more).

- **Ben Damah**, the nephew of **R' Yishmael**, asked **R' Yishmael**, someone like me, who has learned all of the Torah, may I study Greek wisdom? **R' Yishmael** answered by stating the pasuk of “lo yamush...vihigisa bo yomam v'layla”. If you can find an hour that is neither day nor night, you can use it to learn Greek wisdom.
  - This argues on **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini**, who said in the name of **R' Yonason**, that this pasuk is not an obligation or a mitzvah, but is rather a bracha that Hashem gave to Yehoshua that he would not forget his learning (since learning Torah was so beloved to Yehoshua).
- **R' Yishmael's** yeshiva taught a Braisa that said, learning Torah should not be viewed as an obligation which one looks forward to paying off, because one never becomes patur from learning more.
- **Chizkiya** darshens a pasuk to teach that Hashem entices people to learn Torah, and in that way to be saved from Gehenom. The drasha then teaches of the severity of Gehenom and says that even one who was a talmid chochom and then left the Torah will also end up in Gehenom. However, the reward for learning Torah is not just the saving from Gehenom. Rather, there is abundant positive reward as well.

CHAL YOM HAKIPURIM LIHIYOS B'SHABBOS...

- **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the people were actually not from Bavel, but were rather from Alexandria, but because the Rabanan didn't like the people of Bavel they referred to these people as being from Bavel.
  - There is a Braisa in which **R' Yose** says this same thing.

-----Daf 100-----

MISHNA

- If the breads were arranged on the Shulchan on Shabbos and the spoons of levonah were not placed there until after Shabbos, and the levonah was then offered the next Shabbos, the breads are passul, and there would therefore be no chiyuv for piggul, nossar, or tamei associated with these breads.
- If the breads and the levonah were arranged on the Shulchan on Shabbos and the levonah was offered on the Mizbe'ach the very next day, the breads become passul, and there would therefore be no chiyuv for piggul, nossar, or tamei associated with these breads.
- If the breads and the levonah were arranged on the Shulchan on Sunday and the levonah was then offered that following Shabbos, the breads become passul. What can be done to make the breads valid? All should be left on the Shulchan until the (second) following Shabbos, because even if the breads remain on the Shulchan for many days it is not problematic.

GEMARA

- A Mishna says, at the very end of the night, the s'gan would say to the Kohanim, “Go out and see if the time for the shechita of the Tamid has arrived”. If it had arrived, the Kohen who went to check says “Barkai” (it is light). **Masya ben Shmuel** says, “The entire eastern sky has lit up”. It would then be asked, “Until Chevron?” , and he would reply, “Yes”. This exchange was necessary because it once happened that the Kohen mistook the moonlit sky for sunrise, and shechted the Tamid. The Tamid was therefore passul and had to be burned. The Kohen Gadol was then brought down to the mikvah. The general rule was, any Kohen who went to the bathroom had to go to the mikvah before returning to the Beis Hamikdash. Any Kohen who only urinates must wash his hands and feet from the kiyor.
  - **R' Avin's father** taught, the melikah of a bird korbon and taking of a kometz from a Mincha are also passul if done at night, and must be burned.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** It makes sense that the bird would have to be burned, because the melika cannot be reversed once done. However, why can't the kometz be returned to the Mincha and separated again after sunrise? Why must it be burned? **A:** When the kometz is placed into a kli shareis, it becomes kodesh (a kli shareis makes something in it kodesh even if it was placed there at an improper time) and can no longer be returned to the rest of the Mincha. Therefore, it must be burned.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that something which must be offered by day can only become kadosh by day. If so, how did the kometz become kodesh at night!? **A:** It only becomes *fully* kodesh by day, however, even at night it becomes kadosh enough to become passul.
  - **Q:** **R' Zeira** asked, our Mishna says (in the last case) that if Lechem Hapanim is placed on the Shulchan at the wrong time, it does not become automatically passul. According to what was just answered, it should become kadosh and passul since the Shulchan is a kli shareis!? **A:** **Rabbah** said, this would seemingly refute what **R' Avin's father** said, but **R' Avin's father** had a Braisa to support his view as well, and therefore, he cannot be refuted just because a Mishna says differently. The Braisa must hold that a kli shareis only makes something kadosh so that it becomes passul when it is placed in the kli shareis the night before its proper time, not any earlier than that (the case of the Lechem Hapanim was where it was placed on Sunday, when it should be placed there on Shabbos).
    - **Q:** On Friday night it should become passul (because it is the night before the proper time)!? **A:** **Ravina** said, it is talking about where the bread was removed before Friday night arrived and replaced there Shabbos morning. **A2:** **Mar Zutra** said, that even if it remains there Friday night it does not become passul, because since it was placed there far in advance it has the status as if put there without any intention at all, in which case it does not become kodesh at all until its proper time.

### MISHNA

- The Shte Halechem are eaten not less than two days, and not more than three days, after they are baked. How so? Generally they are baked on Erev Yom Tov and are eaten on Yom Tov, which is the second day after being baked. If Yom Tov comes out on Sunday, they are baked on Friday and not eaten until Sunday, which is the third day after having been baked.
- The Lechem Hapanim are eaten not less than 9 days, and not more than 11 days, after they are baked. How so? Generally they are baked on Erev Shabbos and eaten on the Shabbos which is a week later, which is the 9<sup>th</sup> day after having been baked. If a Yom Tov falls on a Friday, they are baked on Thursday, meaning that they are eaten on the 10<sup>th</sup> day after having been baked. If Rosh Hashanah falls out on a Thursday and Friday, they would be baked on Wednesday, meaning that they would not be eaten until the 11<sup>th</sup> day after having been baked. This is because their baking does not override Shabbos or Yom Tov.
- **R' Shimon ben Gamliel in the name of R' Shimon ben HaSgan** said, the baking does override Yom Tov, but does not override Yom Kippur.

### GEMARA

- **Ravina** said, according to the view that voluntary korbanos may not be brought on Yom Tov, they may not be brought even D'Oraisa. In fact, we find that the obligatory Shte Halechem may not be baked on Shabbos or Yom Tov, which would mean that it is D'Oraisa (because there would be no reason for the **Rabanan** to be goizer against their baking).

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK SHTEI HALECHEM!!!**

**PEREK HAMENACHOS V'HANESACHIM -- PEREK SHNAYIM ASSAR**

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## MISHNA

- Menachos and nesachim that became tamei before becoming kadosh in a kli shareis may be redeemed. Once they have become kadosh in a keili they may no longer be redeemed.
- Bird korbanos, wood for the Mizbe'ach, levonah, and klei shareis that become tamei may not be redeemed, because the concept of redemption only applies to animals.

## GEMARA

- **Shmuel** said, the menachos and nesachim can be redeemed even if they are tahor. The reason is, that until they become kadosh in a kli shareis they only have monetary kedusha, and monetary kedusha is subject to redemption.
  - **Q:** The Mishna says they can be redeemed when they “became tamei”!? **A:** In truth they can be redeemed even if they are not tamei. However, since the next part of the Mishna says that if they became kodesh in a kli shareis they may not be redeemed, and that is true even if they became tamei, the Mishna in the beginning also discusses where they became tamei.
- **Q:** It seems obvious that menachos and nesachim that became kadosh in a kli shareis can't be redeemed!? They have kedushas haguf and therefore certainly can't be redeemed!? **A:** We would have thought to say that since a baal mum is referred to as “tamei”, something that is tamei should also be treated as a baal mum, which although it has kedushas haguf, is redeemed, and therefore something with kedushas haguf that became tamei should also be redeemed. The Mishna therefore teaches that when a baal mum is called tamei it was not with regard to a tamei korbon that was made kadosh in a kli shareis, because something that was made kadosh in a kli shareis can never be redeemed.
  - A Braisa darshens pesukim which teach that the “tamei animal” referred to in a pasuk is actually an animal that is a baal mum.

## -----Daf Xᶑ---101-----

- The Gemara said that **Shmuel** said that nesachim and menachos may be redeemed even if they have not become tamei, as long as they had not yet become kadosh in a kli shareis.
  - **Q: R' Huna bar Manoach** asked, our Mishna said that bird korbanos, wood, levonah, and klei shareis that became tamei are not subject to redemption, because redemption was only said for animal korbanos. Now, we can understand that birds can't be redeemed, because they have kedushas haguf. But, wood, levonah, and klei shareis don't have kedushas haguf and should be able to be redeemed. Rather, we must say that since tahor menachos and nesachim can't be redeemed these other items can't be redeemed even when they are tamei, because they are treated as if they are tahor – because wood is not muchshar to be mekabel tumah until it is cut down into size, levonah does not become muchshar until it is put into a kli shareis, and a kli shareis can be made tahor in a mikvah. Based on this, our Mishna suggests that nesachim and menachos could not be redeemed if they are not tamei, which contradicts **Shmuel**!? **A:** The Mishna may mean that tahor items may be redeemed. The reason that wood, levonah, and klei shareis may not be redeemed is that they are not common and therefore cannot be easily replaced if they are redeemed.
    - **Q:** It makes sense to say that levonah and klei shareis are not common, but wood is easily found!? **A:** To find wood without any worms, which is the only wood that is valid for the Mizbe'ach, is not common.
  - **R' Pappa** said, a Braisa says that if one makes an animal without a mum kodesh for bedek habayis it may only be redeemed for use on the Mizbe'ach. We see that even though it only has monetary kedusha it may not be redeemed if it is tahor. **R' Pappa** said, had **Shmuel** learned this Braisa, he would have retracted what he said!

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Gemara says, this is not correct. **Shmuel** knew of this Braisa and still did not retract his view. The reason the animals may not be redeemed is based on the reason we gave earlier, that finding animals without any mum is not common and that is why it may not be redeemed.
- **R' Kahana** said, that the Mishna means that menachos and nesachim that are tamei may be redeemed, but ones that are tahor may not. **R' Oshaya** said this as well. **Others** say that **R' Oshaya** said that they may be redeemed even when tahor. **R' Elazar** said, that all menachos may only be redeemed when tamei, except for the tenth of an eiphah of a chatas mincha, which may be redeemed even when tahor, based on the words “meichataso” and “ahl chataso” in the pesukim.
  - **R' Oshaya** said, I have heard that if one had a piggul intent for a mincha, according to **R' Shimon** it would not become tamei with food tumah. **R' Shimon** says in a Mishna that something that is assur b'hana'ah does not become tamei with food tumah, except for the case of meat cooked in milk, because it had a “moment of fitness” before they were cooked together. **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** explains that **R' Shimon** darshens the pasuk of “mikol ha'ochel asher ye'acheil” to teach that food that can be given to goyim to eat can become tamei with food tumah, but food that cannot be given to a goy to eat (because it is assur b'hana'ah) is not subject to food tumah. Therefore, a mincha that was the subject of piggul intent, and is therefore assur b'hana'ah, also cannot become tamei with food tumah.
    - **Q:** If **R' Yochanan's** reason is correct, why does **R' Shimon** say that meat cooked in milk could become tamei with food tumah because it had a moment of fitness? According to **R' Yochanan** the reason is that **R' Shimon** holds in a Braisa that meat cooked in milk is mutar b'hana'ah!? **A:** The Braisa means to give a second reason as to why it can become tamei with food tumah – first, it is mutar b'hana'ah, and second, it had a moment of fitness before it became assur.
    - **Q:** A Braisa clearly says that **R' Shimon** says that if one had piggul intent for a mincha it is subject to food tumah!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing a case where the mincha had a moment of fitness before becoming kadosh, whereas **R' Oshaya** is talking about a case where it did not have a moment of fitness.
    - **Q:** What is the case of a mincha that did not have a moment of fitness before becoming kadosh? It must be that it was made kadosh while still attached to the ground. However, since the grain could be redeemed, it should be considered to have had a moment of fitness. Now, this makes sense according to the version that says that **R' Oshaya** says that tahor menachos may not be redeemed. However, according to the version that says that it may be redeemed, since it can be redeemed it should be considered to have a moment of fitness!? **A:** The fact is that it was not redeemed, and since it was not redeemed, although it *could* be redeemed, it is not considered to have had a moment of fitness.
      - **Q:** We find that **R' Shimon** holds in a Braisa regarding a parah adumah, that something that can be redeemed is considered to have been redeemed for purposes of making it subject to food tumah!? **A:** The case of parah adumah is very different, because it stands to be redeemed in the sense that if a nicer parah is found it would be a mitzvah to redeem it and instead use the nicer one. That concept does not apply to menachos and that is why it is different.
        - **Q:** The Braisa quoted earlier said that **R' Shimon** says that a korbon that became passul with linah without having had a zrika done to it, is not subject to food tumah. Now, there is a mitzvah to do the zrika and he could have done the zrika, and we see that is not enough to give it the status as if it was done, and it is still not subject to food tumah!? **A:** The case in the Braisa is where there was not enough time left in the day to do a zrika.
          - **Q:** This suggests that if there was enough time left in the day to have done the zrika, it would be subject to food tumah. If so, when the Braisa wants to give a case of where it would be subject to food tumah, why does it give the case of where it was left overnight after having done a zrika to it? Why not instead give the case where it was left overnight

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

when there was enough time to have done a zrika to it? **A:** That is actually what the Braisa means to say.

- **Q:** The Braisa quoted earlier said that **R' Shimon** says that a korbon that became passul as piggul, is not subject to food tumah. Now, there is a mitzvah to do the zrika properly, and he could have done the zrika properly, and we see that that is not enough to give it the status as if it was done, and it is still not subject to food tumah!? **A:** The case of the Braisa is where he had the piggul intent during the shechita, in which case it never had a chance to become mutar to be eaten.
  - **Q:** This suggests that if the piggul intent was had during the zrika, it would be subject to food tumah. If so, when the Braisa wants to give a case of where it would be subject to food tumah, why does it give the case of piggul of a mincha? Why not instead give the case of piggul done to an animal korbon during the zrika!? **A:** The Braisa wanted to give the case of mincha to teach that even if the piggul intent was had during the kemitza, which is like the shechita of an animal korbon, it would still become subject to food tumah, since it had a moment of fitness.

### -----Daf דף---102-----

- The Gemara had said that **R' Shimon** holds that if something stands to be redeemed, it is considered as if it has been redeemed with regard to being considered as if it had a moment of fitness for purposes of food tumah. The Gemara also said that **R' Shimon** holds that if something stands to have a zrika done to it, it is considered as if the zrika was done for purposes of food tumah. Based on this, the Gemara said that **R' Shimon's** ruling was specifically in a case where a zrika could not have been done.
  - **R' Ashi** said that he repeated this to **R' Nachman**, who said that **R' Shimon** may even be discussing a case where a zrika could have been done, and that although **R' Shimon** holds that if there was a possibility for redemption it is considered to have been redeemed, he does not hold that if there was a chance to do the zrika it is considered to have been done (zrika is a true act and therefore can't be considered as done without the act having been done, whereas redemption is a matter of words, which we can view as having been said even if they weren't said).
    - **Q:** A Mishna says, **R' Yehoshua** says a rule: any korbon that had a moment of permissibility for the Kohanim before it became passul, is not subject to me'ilah, whereas a korbon that did not have a moment of permissibility before becoming passul is subject to me'ilah. What is a case of a passul korbon that had a moment of permissibility for the Kohanim? It is a korbon that became passul with linah, or that became tamei, or that left the area that it must be in. What is a case of a passul korbon that did not have a moment of permissibility? It is a korbon that became passul with intent for beyond its time or beyond its place, or where a passul person did the kabbalah and zrika. Now, the Mishna says that the case of linah is a case where there was a moment of permissibility. Presumably, this case is even where the meat and the blood were left overnight, without a zrika having been done, and we see that the fact that a zrika *could* have been done is enough of a reason to consider this korbon as having had a moment of permissibility!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where a zrika was actually done before it was left overnight.
      - **Q:** Based on this, if a korbon was left overnight without a zrika having been done, the Mishna would hold that it is subject to me'ilah. However, the words of the Mishna do not suggest this approach. The Mishna is stated in past tense – “any korbon that *had* a moment of permissibility” and “any korbon that *did not have* a moment of permissibility”, which suggests that the korbon became fit to become permitted, without having actually become permitted. If what we have just said is correct, that the Mishna means to include only where the zrika was actually done, the Mishna should have used the present tense – “any korbon that *has*...” and “any korbon that *does not*...”

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

*have...!*? Based on the words of the Mishna it would seem to suggest that if something stands to have a zrika done we consider it as if it was done. This refutes **R' Ashi**! **A:** Rather, **R' Ashi** said, you can't ask from a case of me'ilah on a case of tumah. With regard to me'ilah, it depends on whether there is kedusha in the korbon or not, and therefore, once it is ready to have a zrika done the kedusha is considered to be removed. With regard to food tumah, it depends on whether the item is considered to be a food. It is only considered to be a food once the zrika *actually* took place.

- **Q:** A Mishna says, if one brings an asham taluy and then finds out that he never did the aveira that he thought he did, if he did not yet shecht the animal, **R' Meir** says the animal becomes chullin, the **Chachomim** say it should be left to graze and get a mum and sold and the proceeds should be used to bring an olas nedavah, and **R' Eliezer** says it should still be brought as an asham, because the person has certainly done another aveira that requires the korbon. If the korbon was already shechted, the blood should be poured out and the meat should be burned off the Mizbe'ach. If the zrika had already been done, the meat should be eaten by the Kohanim. **R' Yose** says, even if the blood was still in the cup from the kabbalah, a zrika should be done and the meat should be eaten. **Rava** explained that **R' Yose** follows the view of **R' Shimon** who says that something that stands ready for zrika is considered as if the zrika was already done, and therefore, since the blood was ready for zrika before he found out that the korbon was not needed, it is considered as if it was already done and the meat becomes mutar for the Kohanim. We see that **R' Shimon** holds this way even to establish something as a food! **A:** **R' Ashi** would argue with **Rava** and would say like **R' Yose bar Chanina**, that the reason of **R' Yose** is that he holds that a kli shareis makes kodesh what is put inside of it, even if the thing put inside is passul, and it makes it kodesh to be offered even l'chatchila.
- **R' Ashi** asked **R' Kahana**, since we say that according to **R' Shimon** when something is ready to have a zrika done it is considered as if the zrika was done, he must also say that when something stands to be burned it is considered as if it has been burned. If so, why does **R' Shimon** say that nossar and parah adumah are subject to food tumah? They should be considered as having been reduced to ashes and should therefore not be subject to food tumah! **R' Kahana** said, the fact that they are items of kodesh makes them subject to the tumah even though they are viewed as ash.
  - **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, if you are saying that the fact that items are kodesh makes them fully subject to tumah, to the extent that they can become tamei and make other things tamei as well, we should be able to answer the question posed by **Reish Lakish**, whether a dry piece of a mincha is only tamei or whether it can make other things tamei as a rishon and sheini as well! **A: Reish Lakish** was asking for the halacha D'Oraisa, whereas we were discussing the status D'Rabanan.

### MISHNA

- If a person said "I am obligating myself to bring a mincha in a machavas keili" and he then brought a mincha in a marcheshes keili, or visa-versa, the mincha is valid but he has not fulfilled his obligation.
  - If a person said "This flour is to be brought in a machavas" and he then brought it in a marcheshes, or visa-versa, the mincha is passul.
- If a person said "I am obligating myself to bring a mincha of two issaron of flour in one keili" and he then brought it in two keilim (one issaron in each), or visa-versa, the mincha is valid, but he has not fulfilled his obligation.
  - If he said "These two issaron are to be brought in one keili" and he then brought them in two keilim, or visa-versa, they are passul.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If a person said “I am obligating myself to bring a mincha of two issaron of flour in one keili” and he then brought it in two keilim, and the people then told him “You obligated yourself to bring them in one keili!”, and he anyway continued to bring them in two keilim, it is passul. If after being told, he put all the flour into one keili, it is valid.
  - If a person said “I am obligating myself to bring a mincha of two issaron of flour in two keilim” and he then brought it in one keili, and the people then told him “You obligated yourself to bring them in two keilim!”, if he then listened and put the flour into two keilim, they are valid. If after being told, he put all the flour into one keili, it is like a case of where two menachos became mixed in one keili.

### GEMARA

- Both cases of the beginning of the Mishna are needed. If the Mishna would have only given the case of where the person switched the machavas and the marcheshes, we would think that in that case he has not fulfilled his obligation, because he brought an entirely different mincha than he had obligated himself to bring. However, in the second case, where he brought the type he was supposed to bring and only switched the amount of flour, we would think he has fulfilled his obligation. If we would only have this second case we would have thought that the change in size is what leaves his obligation as unfulfilled, but in the first case, where the size was as he had promised, we would say that his obligation has been fulfilled.
- A Braisa regarding our Mishna says, when the mincha brought was different than the one promised to be brought, the mincha is valid but he has not fulfilled his obligation. **R’ Shimon** says, that he even fulfills his obligation with this other mincha.

### ZU L’HAVI B’MACHAVAS

- **Q:** A Braisa says, that when ingredients for one type of mincha are put into a kli shareis for another type of mincha the wrong keili does not make them kadosh. If so, why does our Mishna say that it is passul? **A: Abaye** said, the Braisa means that it doesn’t make it kadosh to be brought on the Mizbe’ach, but it does make it kadosh to become passul.
  - **Abaye** said, it only becomes passul when he established the type of mincha at the time that he made the neder. However, if he made a general neder for a mincha and only later, when designating the flour, did he say what type of mincha it should be for, it would not become passul if it is brought for another type of mincha. This is based on the pasuk of “kasher nadarta”, which teaches that one must bring the korbon as he promised, but not necessarily as what was designated at another time.
    - This same thing was said by **R’ Acha bar Chanina in the name of R’ Assi in the name of R’ Yochanan.**

-----Daf לך-----103-----

### MISHNA

- If someone promises to bring a mincha of barley, he must bring a mincha of wheat. If he promised to bring a mincha of “kemach” (regular flour), he must bring a mincha of “soles” (fine flour). If he promised to bring a mincha without oil and levonah, he must bring a mincha with oil and levonah. If he promised to bring a half issaron, he must bring a full issaron. If he promised to bring 1.5 issaron, he must bring 2 issaron. **R’ Shimon** said, the person who promises in any of these ways would be patur from having to bring a mincha, because he has not promised to bring something that is brought.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** Why don’t we view the second part of his statement as a retraction of his promise to bring the korbon (since he knows that a mincha cannot be brought as he states in the second part of his statement, we should view it as a retraction of his promise to bring a mincha)? **A: Chizkiya** said, this Mishna follows **B”S** who say that when a person makes a contradictory statement, we follow the first part of the statement. **R’ Yochanan** said the Mishna can even follow **B”H**, because the Mishna is talking about a case where the person then said, had I known that I must bring the mincha with wheat, or soles, etc., I would have promised to do so.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Chizkiya** said, the **T”K** only says it is a valid promise when he promised to bring a mincha of barley (since there is a concept of a mincha being brought from barley, albeit not a donated one), but a promise to bring a mincha of lentils would not be a valid promise and would not create an obligation.
  - **Q: Chizkiya** explained that the Mishna is following **B”S**. The reason of **B”S** is that they say we follow the first part of the statement. If so, why would it make a difference whether he said barley or lentils? **A: Chizkiya** retracted his answer that the Mishna follows **B”S**. **Rava** explained, the reason he retracted is because the Mishna gave the example of where he promised to bring a mincha of barley. Why didn’t it give an example of where he promised a mincha of lentils, which would be a bigger chiddush? It must be that the Mishna specifically gave the example of barley, because it is that case where a person can have made a mistake and thought that a promise can be made to bring a mincha of barley. However, one cannot even mistakenly think that a mincha can be brought from lentils, and therefore, in that case he would not be obligated to bring a mincha.
- **R’ Yochanan** said, the **T”K** even says it is a valid promise when he promised to bring a mincha of lentils.
  - **Q: R’ Yochanan** explained that the Mishna follows **B”H**. According to them, the reason the promise is effective is because the person mistakenly thought that one may bring a mincha of barley. That thought process does not apply to a mincha of lentils, so why would that statement create an obligation? **A: R’ Yochanan** made this statement according to **Chizkiya**. He was saying to **Chizkiya**, why did you retract your opinion that the Mishna follows **B”S**? It is because the Mishna didn’t give the example of lentils. Maybe the Mishna didn’t give the example of lentils because that is actually the more obvious case!? If he promises to bring a mincha of lentils we would say to follow only the first part of his statement, because saying he wants to bring a mincha from lentils is clearly an attempt to retract the promise, which **B”S** say he can’t do, because we follow the first part of his statement. However, when he promises to bring barley, it is more possible to say that he is making an honest mistake and was not trying to retrace his promise, and it therefore is not two separate statements that are to be divided. The Mishna is teaching that even in that case we say that we divide the statement and only give effect to the first part of the statement.
- **Ze’iri** said, the promise obligates him to bring a mincha of wheat only when he promised to bring a “mincha min hase’orim” (we would view that as two statements that can be divided). However, if he promised to bring a “minchas se’orim” or just “se’orim” (second understanding of Rashi), the statement can’t be divided and he would not be obligated to bring a mincha.
  - **Q: R’ Nachman** repeated this and **Rava** asked him, the Mishna then gives the case of a promise to bring “kemach” and says he would have to bring “soles”. The Mishna makes no mention of him saying the word “mincha” and still says that it creates an obligation!? **A:** The Mishna refers back to the first case and means that there was a mention of “mincha” there as well.
    - **Q:** The Mishna then gives the case of a promise to bring “without oil or levonah” and says he would have to bring “with oil and levonah”. The Mishna makes no mention of him saying the word “mincha” and still says that it creates an obligation!? **A:** The Mishna refers back to the first case and means that there was a mention of “mincha” there as well.
    - **Q:** The Mishna then gives the case of a promise to bring “a half issaron” and says he would have to bring “a full issaron”. The Mishna makes no mention of him saying the word “mincha” and still says that it creates an obligation!? **A:** The Mishna refers back to the first case and means that there was a mention of “mincha” there as well.
    - **Q:** If so, the last case of the Mishna would be where he promised to bring “a mincha of an issaron and a half”. In that case we would view the phrase “a mincha of an issaron” as obligating him to bring a regular mincha, and the remaining words of “and a half issaron” should be viewed as not creating an obligation at all!? Why does the Mishna say that he must bring 2 issaron!? **A:** The case is where he promised to bring “a mincha

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

of a half issaron and an issaron". When he says "a mincha" he becomes obligated to bring a mincha of an issaron. The words "half issaron" create no obligation. The words "an issaron" create an obligation for a second issaron. That is why he must bring two issaron.

- **Q:** If this is the way to understand the Mishna, why does **R' Shimon** argue and say that there is no obligation because he has not donated in the way that people donate? Since the Mishna follows **B"S**, who only look at the first part of each statement, he has obligated himself in the way that people obligate themselves!? **A:** **Rava** said, **R' Shimon** follows the view of **R' Yose**, who says that we also look to the end of a person's statement and give effect to it as well.

### MISHNA

- A person may donate a mincha of up to 60 issaron and bring it all in one keili. If he promises to donate a mincha of 61 issaron, he brings 60 issaron in one keili and one issaron in a second keili. For we find that the tzibbur brings a mincha of 61 issaron on the first day of Succos that falls on a Shabbos. It is therefore fitting that an individual can only bring a maximum of one issaron less than the largest mincha of the tzibbur. **R' Shimon** said, the 61 issaron brought by the tzibbur is a combination of issaron offered with different parim and with different lambs. The issaron for the different korbanos are not mixed together (so why would this serve as the basis for the maximum amount of issaron that can be brought in one keili)!? Rather, the reason that only 60 issaron can be brought in one keili is that up to 60 issaron, the oil and flour are capable of being mixed, whereas if there are more than 60 issaron, the oil and flour are not capable of being mixed. The **Rabanan** said to him, can it really be that 60 can be effectively mixed, but 61 cannot? **R' Shimon** said, all measurements of the **Rabanan** are such (they are given as an exact measure). For example, they say that in 40 se'ah a person can be toivel himself, but in 40 se'ah less one kortov a person cannot be toivel himself.

### GEMARA

- It was asked in front of **R' Yehuda bar Illai**, how do we know that when a person promises to bring a mincha of 61 issaron, he brings 60 in one keili and one in a second keili? **R' Yehuda bar Illai** said, for we find that the tzibbur brings a mincha of 61 issaron on the first day of Succos that falls on a Shabbos. It is therefore fitting that an individual can only bring a maximum of one issaron less than the largest mincha of the tzibbur. **R' Shimon** said, the 61 issaron brought by the tzibbur is a combination of issaron offered with different parim and rams and with different lambs, which have different thicknesses to them (the amount of oil per issaron of flour is different for different animals), and which are mixed at different times of the day (depending on the korbon), and therefore are not mixed together (so why would this serve as the basis for the maximum amount of issaron that can be brought in one keili)!? He said to **R' Shimon**, you tell us the reason then. **R' Shimon** said, the Torah says to bring a mincha that can be mixed (and 60 issaron can be mixed, whereas 61 cannot). **R' Yehuda** said to him, can it really be that 60 can be effectively mixed, but 61 cannot? **R' Shimon** said, all measurements of the **Rabanan** are such (they are given as an exact measure). For example, they say that in 40 se'ah a person can be toivel himself, but in 40 se'ah less one kortov a person cannot be toivel himself; food the size of a beitzah is subject to food tumah, but if it is smaller by the size of a sesame seed it would not; a cloth that is 3x3 tefachim could become tamei medras, whereas if it is 3x3 less one thread it does not.
  - **Q:** Why is it problematic if it can't be mixed? A Mishna says that if the oil and the flour were not mixed the mincha is still valid!? **A:** **R' Zeira** said, if a mincha is fit to be mixed, mixing is not essential, but if it is not fit to be mixed, mixing is essential.
- **R' Bibi in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, it once happened that a mule of **Rebbi** died, and the **Rabanan** measured the blood to see if there was a revi'is of blood, in which case it would give off tumah. **R' Yitzchak bar Bisna** asked, a Braisa says that **R' Yehoshua** and **R' Yehoshua ben Beseira** testified that blood of a neveila is tahor, and **R' Yehoshua ben Beseira** cited an incident where the people going up to be oleh regel walked through blood of a neveila and the **Chachomim** did not stop them from entering the Beis Hamikdash complex!?

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

**R' Bibi** remained silent. **R' Zrika** said to him, why didn't you answer? **R' Bibi** explained that he was not financially stable and therefore did not have the presence of mind to answer.

- **Q:** What is the answer to this seeming contradiction from the Braisa? **A:** **R' Yosef** said, **R' Yehuda** was the posek for the Nasi (for the house of **Rebbi**), and it was therefore he who paskened that a revi'is of blood would be tamei. He follows his own view elsewhere in a Braisa where he says that **B"H** hold that the blood of a neveila is tamei.