



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

### Menachos Daf Kuf Aleph

- 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!
    - 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 "mikol ha'ochel asher yei'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 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.