



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

Menachos Daf Tzaddik

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 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 shelamim 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 korbono min habakar” and another pasuk says “v’ihm min hatzon korbono”. 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.