



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

Menachos Daf Kuf Beis

- 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 korbán that had a moment of permissibility for the Kohanim before it became passul, is not subject to me'ilah, whereas a korbán that did not have a moment of permissibility before becoming passul is subject to me'ilah. What is a case of a passul korbán that had a moment of permissibility for the Kohanim? It is a korbán 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 korbán that did not have a moment of permissibility? It is a korbán 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 korbán 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 korbán 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 korbán that *had* a moment of permissibility” and “any korbán that *did not have* a moment of permissibility”, which suggests that the korbán 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 korbán that *has*...” and “any korbán that *does not 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 korbán 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.
- 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.**