



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Menachos Daf Mem Tes

- **Rabbah bar bar Chana** taught a Braisa in front of **Rav** that said, if the Shavuot lambs were shechted for the sake of rams (which are older sheep than lambs), it is valid but has not fulfilled the obligation of the tzibbur to bring the shelamim. **Rav** said, they have definitely fulfilled their obligation.
 - **R' Chisda** said, **Rav's** ruling makes sense where the one who shechted thought the lambs were rams (he was mistaken) and then shechted them for the sake of lambs (according to his mistake he was shechting it not lishma, although in reality they were lambs that were being shechted for the sake of lambs). However, if he thought that the lambs were rams and intended to shecht them as rams (so that the intent was actually not lishma), it would make sense to say that the tzibbur has not fulfilled its obligation. This is because an "uprooting in error" (the shelo lishma was done based on an error) is considered to be an uprooting (i.e. it is considered to be a true shelo lishma) and therefore wouldn't fulfil the tzibbur's obligation. **Rabbah** said that an "uprooting in error" is not considered to be an uprooting (it is not considered to be shelo lishma), and therefore, even in that case **Rav** meant to say that the tzibbur would have fulfilled its obligation.
 - **Q: Rabbah** said, we can ask on our teaching based on a Mishna which says that if a Kohen makes something piggul (with his intent), if he did so b'meidid he is chayuv to pay the owner for the korbon, if it was b'shogeg he is patur. A Braisa explained that in either case the intent causes the korbon to be passul as piggul. Now, what is the case of shogeg? If he knew that the korbon was, for example, a chatas and he intended that it would be eaten like a shelamim (beyond the time of a chatas) then that would be a case of meizid! Rather, it must be that he thought it was a shelamim and he therefore intended that it be eaten like a shelamim, and still it becomes piggul. We see that an "uprooting in error" is considered to be an uprooting!? **A: Abaye** said, the case may be that he knew it was a chatas and intended that it be eaten as a shelamim, and the case of shogeg is that he thought it is mutar to have such an intent.
 - **Q: R' Zeira** asked, a Braisa says, **R' Shimon** says, all menachos whose kemitza was done not lishma are valid and even fulfill the owner's obligation. This is because menachos are different than animal korbanos in that each type of mincha is *noticeably* different than the other (a dry mincha is noticeably different than one with a lot of oil, a machavas is noticeably different than a marcheshes, etc.) and therefore the noticeable difference counters and refutes the intent of shelo lishma. However, with animal korbanos all the avodos are the same – they have the same shechita, kabbalah, and zrika. Now, what is the case? If he knew it was a machavas and he intended the kemitza for the sake of a marcheshes, who cares if it is noticeably different? He has purposely uprooted the machavas!? Rather, the case must be where he *thinks* it is a marcheshes and does the kemitza for a marcheshes, in which case his uprooting intent was done in error. Now, it is only by a mincha that it remains valid, because the noticeable difference refutes his intent. This suggests that in other cases an "uprooting in error" would be an uprooting!? **A: Abaye** said, the case is that he knew it was a machavas and still intended for a marcheshes. We must follow **Rabbah's** explanation of **R' Shimon**, and **Rabbah** says that **R' Shimon** holds that shelo lishma of a mincha only makes it passul when it is not a recognizably false intent. However, when it is obviously false, it does not become passul.

MISHNA

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

GEMARA

- **Q: R' Chiya bar Avin** asked **R' Chisda**, if the tzibbur does not have enough animals for the temidim and the mussafim, which takes precedence? [The Gemara asks, what is the case at question? If it is regarding the tamid for that day and the mussaf for that day it should be obvious that the tamid takes precedence, because it is both tadir and mekudash!? Rather, the question is when the animal could either be saved for the tamid of the following day or for the mussaf of today. The question is, do we say that the tamid takes precedence because it is tadir, or do we say that the mussaf takes precedence because it is mekudash (since it is brought on a Yom Tov and is brought on the day in question)?] **A: R' Chisda** said, we can answer from our Mishna, which said that the temidim are not essential to the mussafim and the mussafim are not essential to the temidim, and the mussafim are not essential to each other. What is the Mishna referring to? It can't be where there are enough animals and the question is which korbon is to be offered first, because a Braisa darshens a pasuk to teach that the Tamid must be the first korbon of the day! Rather, it is obvious that the Mishna is referring to where there are not enough animals for both korbanos. Now, the case can't be where the question is to use it for the tamid of today or the mussaf of today, because in that case it would be clear that we would use it for the tamid, since it is both tadir and mekudash! Rather, the question must be whether to use the animal for the tamid of tomorrow or the mussaf of today, and the Mishna says that neither is essential to the other, which means that they are of equal status and neither takes precedence!
 - **Abaye** said, the Mishna is not a valid proof. The Mishna may be dealing with the question of which korbon is offered first when there are sufficient animals for both korbanos. Although the Braisa learns from a pasuk that nothing may be offered before the Tamid, that is the ideal case, but if the mussaf were to be brought first, it would be valid.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from a Mishna which says that we may never have less than 6 lambs in the "lishkas hatela'im" that have been fully checked, enough for the korbanos of Shabbos and the 2 days of Rosh Hashanah (when they fall out 3 days in a row). Now, what is the case? If the case is that there are enough animals for all the temidim (2 per day) and the mussafim needed, then there would need to be many more than 6 animals! Rather, the case is where there are only 6 animals, and we see that they are to be saved for the temidim of the next day rather than to be used for the mussaf of today! **A:** The Mishna may be referring to where there are sufficient animals for both. The Mishna is referring to having 6 animals that have each been checked for 4 days, which is the view of **Ben Bag Bag** in a Braisa, where he says that the Tamid must have been checked for a mum for 4 days before being offered.
 - **Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, for these 3 days there should be 7 lambs that are needed, because one more is needed for the morning after the Yom Tov, which is before there will be a chance to buy additional checked animals from the market!? **R' Ashi** said, according to your reasoning, there should need to be 8, because one is needed for the Friday afternoon before the 3 days as well! **Ravina** said, that is

not an issue, because the Mishna is giving the number that is needed after the offering of the Friday afternoon tamid! The question still remains as to why the Mishna doesn't say that 7 are needed. The Gemara answers that the Mishna is actually referring to all times – there should always be at least 6 checked lambs ready to be offered. It does not refer to a case of Shabbos followed by Rosh Hashanah. That was just used as a memory tool of a span where 6 temidim would be brought.