



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

Menachos Daf Kuf Ches

- A Mishna says there were 6 boxes used for collections for nedavos. **Chizkiya** says, there were 6 boxes, corresponding to the 6 "beis av" of Kohanim for the week – each beis av having their own donation box (this ensured that the skins from a particular voluntary Olah would be given to the Kohanim on duty during the day of the donation). **R' Yochanan** says, there were many boxes simply because there were large amounts of donations, and by having a number of boxes we remove the likelihood of too many coins being stored in one box, which would lead to the coins corroding. **Ze'iri** says, the 6 boxes corresponded to the six types of animals valid to be brought as an Olah (ox, calf, ram, lamb, little goat, and big goat), and this follows the view of **Rebbi**, that if one promised to bring a small animal and instead brought a large one, he is not yotzeh. **Bar Pada** says, the 6 were used for money from an animal that was sold after its replacement was used for the korbon. The 6 were 6 cases of this: for the money from a par chatas of the tzibbur that was sold, from the rams of an ashram me'ilah or of an ashram gezeilos that were sold, for the lambs of the ashram of a nazir or a metzora, from the chatas goat of the tzibbur brought on Yom Tov, from extra money that was designated for the purchase of a korbon, and for the ma'ah given along with the machtzis hashekel.
 - All the others don't say like **Chizkiya**, because they don't feel the need to separate for the different groups of Kohanim, since the Kohanim of each day will get the skins of that day. All the other don't say like **R' Yochanan**, because they are not concerned for corrosion. All the others don't say like **Ze'iri**, because they don't want to explain a Mishna as only following one view (i.e. **Rebbi**). They all don't say like **Bar Pada**, because why would one of the boxes be for "extra money that was designated for a korbon"? Aren't the rest of the boxes essentially the same thing? Also, another reason is that a Braisa says that **R' Meir** holds that the ma'ah of the machtzis hashekel went to the shekalim fund, not to a separate box, and presumably the Mishna should be consistent with the view of **R' Meir**.
 - **Shmuel** said, the 6 boxes were used as follows: the excess funds of a chatas, of an ashram, of a nazir's ashram, of a metzora's ashram, of a chatas mincha, and of the Kohen Gadol's chavitin. **R' Oshaya** said, they were used as follows: the excess funds of a chatas, of an ashram, of a nazir's ashram, of a metzora's ashram, of a pair of birds and of a chatas mincha.
 - **Shmuel** doesn't say like **R' Oshaya**, because earlier in the Mishna the Mishna said that another box was used for the money of pairs of birds. **R' Oshaya** said that one box was needed for those who were required to bring birds and one box was for the excess money of pairs of birds.
 - **R' Oshaya** does not say like **Shmuel**, because he holds like the view that the excess of the chavitin is left to spoil. As we find a Braisa that says that the excess of a mincha is considered to be a nedava, and the excess of a mincha is left to rot. **R' Chisda** explained this seemingly contradictory statement to mean that the excess of a chatas mincha is made into a nedava for the tzibbur, and the excess of the chavitin is left to rot (**R' Oshaya** is following the view of **R' Chisda**). **Rabbah** explained the Braisa to mean that even the excess of the chavitin is made into a nedava, and it is the excess of todah breads that is left to rot.
 - This machlokes is the same as a machlokes between **R' Yochanan and R' Elazar** regarding the excess of the chavitin, where **R' Yochanan** says it is made into a nedava and **R' Elazar** says it is left to rot.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that the excess of the "asiris ha'eipha" is made into a nedava. Presumably, this refers to the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol

(which is commonly referred to by that name)!? **A:** It refers to a chatas mincha, which is also brought of an “asiris ha’eipha”.

- **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, that a Braisa suggests like the view that the excess of the chavitin is left to rot. The Braisa darshens a pasuk to teach that the chavitin is not referred to as a chatas. We can learn from this, that since it’s not referred to as a chatas, its excess is not treated as the excess of a chatas mincha, and is instead left to rot.

MISHNA

- If someone said “This ox should be an olah” and it then got a mum (in which case it is redeemed, and the proceeds used to purchase another animal for the korbon), if he wants he may use the money to buy two animals. If he said “These two oxen should be an olah” and they both got a mum, if he wants he may use the redemption money to buy one animal. **Rebbi** says, that is assur (although he would agree that b’dieved he would be yotzeh – Rashi). If he said “This ram should be an olah” and it got a mum, if he wants he may use the redemption money to buy a lamb. If he said “This lamb should be for an olah” and it got a mum, if he wants he may use the proceeds to buy a ram. **Rebbi** says this is assur.

GEMARA

- **Q:** We have learned, that if one promises to bring an ox worth a maneh and he instead brought two oxen that are together worth a maneh he has not fulfilled his obligation!? **A:** The Mishna’s case of “this ox” is different, because he has no obligation to bring another ox once the first one gets a mum.

SHNEI SHEVARIN EILU OLAH...

- **Rebbi** views this as a case of one who promised to bring a large animal and instead brought a small one, in which case it is passul. Therefore, even though it got a mum (which means he no longer has an obligation), **Rebbi** holds that l’chatchila this may not be done.
 - **Q:** Why doesn’t he also argue in the earlier part of the Mishna that allowed the person to redeem the one animal and replace it with two (which is like the case of promising to bring a small animal and instead bringing a large one, which **Rebbi** holds may not be done)? **A:** **Rebbi** is actually arguing on the all the cases of the Mishna, but he waited until the **Rabanan** completed stating their view in both cases before arguing. This must be the case, because we see later in the Mishna that **Rebbi** even says it is assur to replace a lamb with a ram, although the ram is a better quality korbon.
- **Q:** What is the halacha regarding replacing one type of animal with another type of animal (e.g. replacing an ox with two rams)? **A:** A Braisa says, if someone says “This ox should be an olah” and it then got a mum, he may not use the proceeds to bring one ram, but he may use the proceeds to bring two rams. **Rebbi** says it is assur, because there is no mixing of their menachos. We see from here, that a replacement of one animal may be done with a different animal.

SHEMA MINAH.

- **Q:** If so, why must he bring two rams? Even if he brings one, his promise should be fulfilled, because the **Rabanan** say that one may replace a large animal with a small animal!? **A:** There are two Tanna’im who argue as to what the **Rabanan** held about this.
- **Q:** It seems that **Rebbi** would hold that the only reason it is assur is because the menachos can’t be mixed. If the menachos could be mixed it seems that it would be mutar. However, in our Mishna **Rebbi** said that one may not bring a different animal as a replacement even when the replacement only has one mincha (since it is one animal) and there is no problem of mixing of menachos!? **A:** There are two Tanna’im who argue as to what **Rebbi** held.

RATZAH YAVI B’DAMAV SHNAYIM...

- **R’ Menashyeh bar Zvid in the name of Rav** said, this is only if he said “This ox should be an olah”. However, if he said “This ox is on me as an olah”, he becomes responsible to bring the same type of animal and must bring one.
 - **Q:** Maybe he means to create a responsibility to bring this animal, but not a personal obligation to bring a korbon? **A:** Rather, it must be that **R’ Menashyeh bar Zvid in the name of Rav** said, this is only if he said, “This ox should be an olah” or “This ox is on me

as an olah". However, if he said, "This ox and its value in on me as an olah", he becomes responsible to bring an animal of this type under all circumstances.

MISHNA

- If someone said, "One of my lambs should be kodesh" or "One of my oxen should be kodesh": if he had two, the larger one becomes kodesh; if he had three, the middle one becomes kodesh. If he said, "I specified one of them but don't remember which one I specified", or "My father told me that he made one of them kodesh but I don't remember which one", the larger one becomes kodesh.

GEMARA

- **Q:** From the beginning of the Mishna we see that one is generous when he gives to hekdesch. However, from the second part of the Mishna we see that one is not generous when he gives to hekdesch!? **A: Shmuel** said, the Mishna's second case means that we are concerned that he may have meant the middle one, since it is generous compared to the lower one, and therefore the middle and the best ones will be treated as hekdesch. **R' Chiya bar Rav** said, he waits for the middle one to get a mum and then transfers its kedusha to the better one.
 - **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** said, this is only if he said, "One of my oxen should be kodesh". However, if he said, "An ox from among my oxen should be kodesh", only the largest one becomes kodesh, because he is saying that his most prominent ox should become kodesh.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Huna bar Chiya in the name of Ulla** said, if someone tells a buyer that he is selling him "a house from among his houses" he may then claim that he sold him the "aliyah" – which presumably refers to the attic of a house, which is considered inferior to the lower floor!? **A:** "Aliyah" refers to the best quality, not the attic.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if someone says, "An ox from among my oxen should be kodesh", and similarly in a case of an ox of hekdesch that became mixed with other oxen, the largest one is hekdesch and all the rest of them are sold for olos with the proceeds becoming chullin. We see that there is a safek as to which is hekdesch!? **A:** The Braisa is only going on the second case of where it became mixed with the others.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says "and similarly"!? **A:** That is just saying that they share the same halacha in that the larger one is hekdesch. With regard to the rest being sold for olos, that is only in the second case.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if someone told a buyer, "I am selling you a house from among my houses" and one of the houses collapsed, he may claim that the collapsed house is the one he sold to him. If he told a buyer, "I am selling you a slave from among my slaves" and a slave then died, he may claim that the slave that died is the one he sold. Now, according to **Rabbah bar Avuha**, this should only be true if the collapsed house and the dead slave were the best of his houses and slaves!? **A:** The case of a purchaser is different, because the purchaser has the lower hand and must prove that he bought something other than the one that collapsed or died. We can now use this answer for the case of the "aliyah" as well.