



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

### Menachos Daf Ayin Tes

#### MISHNA

- If a todah was shechted with beyond its time or beyond its place intent, the breads still become kadosh. If it was shechted and found to be a treifah, the breads do not become kadosh. If it was shechted and found to be a baal mum, **R' Eliezer** says the breads become kadosh and the **Chachomim** say that they do not. If they were shechted not lishma, and similarly, if the ram of the milu'im or the two Shavuos lambs were shechted not lishma, the breads do not become kadosh.

#### GEMARA

- Our Mishna follows the view of **R' Meir** in a Braisa. The Braisa says, the general rule is, if a todah became passul before the shechita the breads do not become kadosh. If it became passul after the shechita, the breads do become kadosh. If a todah was shechted with beyond its time or beyond its place intent, the breads still become kadosh. If it was shechted and found to be a treifah, the breads do not become kadosh. If it was shechted and found to be a baal mum, **R' Eliezer** says the breads become kadosh and **R' Yehoshua** says that they do not – this is the view of **R' Meir**. **R' Yehuda** says that **R' Eliezer** and **R' Yehoshua** agree that if it was shechted and found to be a treifa, the breads would not become kadosh, and if there was beyond its time intent they would become kadosh, and if it was found to be a baal mum it would not become kadosh. The machlokes is regarding where there was beyond its place intent – **R' Eliezer** holds that they become kadosh and **R' Yehoshua** says that they do not. **R' Eliezer** holds that beyond its place is treated like beyond its time. **R' Yehuda** holds that beyond its place makes the korbon passul and being a baal mum makes the korbon passul – just as if it was a baal mum the breads would not become kadosh, the same is when there was beyond its place intent. **R' Eliezer** said, it makes more sense to treat beyond its place like beyond its time since they are both pesulim that stem from improper intents! **R' Yehoshua** said, it makes more sense to treat beyond its place like the psul of baal mum, because they are both psulim that don't carry kares! Also, we can even treat beyond its place intent like the case of a shechita done not lishma, which is also a psul of improper intent that doesn't carry kares, and also causes that the breads do not become kadosh! **R' Eliezer** remained quiet to that response.
  - **Q:** According to **R' Meir**, why is it that **R' Eliezer** holds that a treifa is considered to be a psul before the shechita and the breads therefore don't become kadosh, but a baal mum is considered to be after the shechita in the sense that the breads do become kadosh? **A:** **R' Eliezer** is referring to the specific mum of cataracts in the eye, which according to **R' Akiva** have some degree of validity (in that if they are brought up onto the Mizbe'ach they are not taken down), and that is why the breads become kadosh. **R' Yehoshua** holds that **R' Akiva** only holds that way with regard to the animal itself, not with regard to the accompanying parts of the korbon.
  - If a chatas was shechted with beyond its time intent, and was then brought up onto the Mizbe'ach, it is not taken down. If it was shechted with beyond its place intent and was then brought up, **Rava** says it is brought down and **Rabbah** says it is not. **Rava** holds like **R' Yehoshua** (who compares beyond its place intent to a baal mum) and **Rabbah** holds like **R' Eliezer** (who compares it to beyond its time). **Rabbah** ended up retracting his view to that of **Rava**, since we find that **R' Eliezer** retracted his view to that of **R' Yehoshua**.
    - **Others** say that even though **R' Eliezer** retracted his view, **Rabbah** did not. The reason **R' Eliezer** retracted was based on **R' Yehoshua's** comment that it should be learned from the case of a shechita not lishma. However, that won't work in

this case, because a korbán shechted not lishma that is then brought up onto the Mizbe'ach would not be taken down.

#### SHACHTA SHELO LISHMA...

- **R' Pappa** said, the Tanna didn't give the example of a nazir's ram and instead gave the example of the milu'im, even though the case of nazir is much more common. The Gemara explains that the Tanna gave the example of the milu'im, because that is the first case of a korbán with accompanying breads.

#### MISHNA

- If nesachim were made kadosh in a keili and the korbán for which it was brought was found to be passul, if there is another korbán that needs nesachim, it should be used for that korbán. If not, they are left overnight and become passul.

#### GEMARA

- **Ze'iri** said that nesachim only become kadosh with the shechting of the korbán. This is based on the pasuk of "zevach unesachim".
  - **Q:** Our Mishna is presumably discussing where the korbán became passul during the shechita and we see that the nesachim are kadosh even though the shechita was not valid!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where it became passul through the zrika, but the shechita was properly done.
    - **Q:** According to this, our Mishna would only follow **Rebbi**, who holds that even the shechita alone would make the Shteí Halechem kadosh, and the same would therefore hold true for nesachim. However, **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** holds that if the zrika was done improperly they would not become kadosh. **A:** The Mishna can even follow **R' Elazar**, and the case would be where after the kabbalah the blood spilled onto the floor and zrika can no longer be done. Since the zrika was not done improperly, the nesachim would become kadosh from the shechita alone, because **R' Elazar** holds like his father **R' Shimon** who says that any blood that is in a keili ready for zrika, is considered in some respects as if the zrika has been done.
- **Q: R' Chisda** has said that if oil has been designated for a korbán mincha, it may not be used for another korbán. How can the Mishna say that the nesachim can be used for another korbán? **A: R' Yannai** said, Beis Din stipulates regarding the nesachim of korbános tzibbur that if they are needed for the korbán they are used for it, and if they are ultimately not needed for it, the nesachim may be used for another korbán.
  - **Q:** Why don't we say the same thing regarding oil? **A:** Oil is considered to be a part of the mincha itself, and therefore can't be used for another mincha.
  - **Q:** Why can't Beis Din stipulate that if the nesachim are not needed they lose their kedusha and become chullin? **A:** We are concerned that people will think that something that became kadosh in a kli shareis can become chullin even without a stipulation.
    - **Q:** Why are we not concerned that people will think that nesachim from one korbán may be used for another korbán even without a stipulation? **A: Matisya ben Yehuda** taught that the case is where the nesachim are used for another korbán that has already been shechted. Therefore, people will think it belonged to that korbán all along.
      - **Q:** This would mean that if there is no other korbán that is shechted there at the time, the nesachim would be left there to become passul with linah. If so, instead of the Mishna saying "if they are left overnight they become passul with linah" it should instead say – when do we say that the nesachim can be used for another korbán, that is only if there is another korbán that has already been shechted, but if there is no other korbán shechted there the nesachim may not be used with another korbán!? **A:** That is essentially what the Mishna is saying. It is saying that if there is no other korbán that is shechted there at that time, the nesachim are treated as if they were pasul with linah and are passul.

- **Q:** The Gemara said that our Mishna follows **R' Shimon** and also said that nesachim can be used for another korban because of Beis Din's stipulation. The Gemara now asks, does **R' Shimon** really hold of the concept that there is a stipulation of Beis Din regarding the kedusha of a korban? We have learned that it was said in the name of **R' Yochanan** that according to **R' Shimon**, a tamid that was not needed may not be redeemed as is, but must rather be left to graze and get a mum. We see that he does not hold of the concept of the stipulation of Beis Din!? **A:** In that case he doesn't hold of the stipulation, because there is a way to deal with them without having to come onto a stipulation – he can let them graze and get a mum.

#### MISHNA

- With regard to the offspring of a todah, or the temurah of a todah, or if a todah was designated and lost and a replacement was designated and the first one was then found, all these surplus todos do not require accompanying breads. This is learned from the pasuk that says "v'hikriv ahl zevach hatodah", which teaches that it is only a regular todah that requires breads, but the offspring, the replacement, or the temurah of a todah does not.

#### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, what do we learn from the pasuk of "todah yakriv"? It teaches that if a todah was designated and then lost, and another animal was designated as a replacement and the first one was then found, either one may be offered. We would think that the second animal to be offered also requires breads to be brought along with it. The pasuk therefore says "yakrivenu", which teaches that only one requires breads, not both. The pasuk of "ihm ahl todah" teaches that the offspring, replacement, and temurah of a todah are offered as well. The pasuk of "v'hikriv ahl zevach hatodah" teaches that it is only the actual todah that requires accompanying breads, but the offspring, replacement, and temurah of a todah does not require accompanying breads.
  - **R' Chanina in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the surplus korban doesn't need breads only if the owner already got his kapparah through the original korban. However, if he had not gotten that yet, the surplus korban would require breads.
    - **Q: R' Amram** asked, which type of surplus is he referring to? He can't be teaching about a replacement korban, because the Braisa already taught that if it is brought first it needs breads and if it is brought second it does not need breads!? He also can't be referring to a donated todah, because that would not be classified as a "replacement" but rather as yet another donated korban, which certainly needs breads!? He also can't be referring to the offspring of a donated todah, because the pasuk teaches that this never needs breads to be brought along with it!? **A:** Rather, he must be referring to the offspring of an obligatory todah, which if brought before the kapparah must have breads brought along with it, and if brought after the kapparah does not need to have breads brought along with it. With this discussion, **R' Amram** is teaching that **R' Yochanan** holds that a person can get a kapparah through an animal that is an appreciation of Hekdesh (the offspring of the korban belongs to Hekdesh).
    - **Abaye** went through the same analysis as **R' Amram** and arrived at the same conclusion.
    - **R' Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan** taught that the replacement of a donated todah needs breads when it is offered, whether before the owner brought the first one or after he brought it. The offspring of a donated todah does not need breads when offered, whether offered before or after the owner brought the initial animal. With regard to the offspring of an obligatory todah, if it is offered before the initial korban, it requires breads. If it is offered after the initial korban, it does not require breads.