



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Menachos, Daf עו – Daf פב

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf עו---76-----

MISHNA

- All menachos require 300 rubbings (he rubs it in his hands to make the shells easily removed) and 500 punches (with his fist).
 - The rubbing and punching is done to the wheat (to make the shells come off easily). **R' Yose** says it is done to the dough (to make a better dough).
- All menachos are brought in groups of ten, except for the Lechem Hapanim and the chavitim of the Kohen Gadol, which are brought in groups of 12. This is the view of **R' Yehuda**. **R' Meir** says all are brought in groups of 12 except for the challos of a todah and a nazir, which are brought in groups of ten.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, he rubs once and punches twice. He then rubs twice and punches 3 times. This continues until there are 300 rubbings and 500 punches.
 - **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, is rolling it back and forth considered to be 2 rubs or one? **TEIKU**.

SHIFA UBE'ITA B'CHITIN R' YOSE OMER B'BATZEIK

- **Q:** Does **R' Yose** mean it is *only* done to the dough or does he mean it's done *also* to the dough (after being done to the wheat)? **A:** A Braisa implies that he holds that it is only done to the dough.

KOL HAMENACHOS BA'OS...

- With regard to the Lechem Hapanim the pasuk explicitly says that there should be 12. With regard to the chavitim of the Kohen Gadol, we learn a gezeira shava from Lechem Hapanim on the word "chukah" to teach that it must also be brought as a group of 12.
- With regard to all other menachos requiring 10, we learn that from the Todah breads – just as those are brought in a group of 10, the same is for all the others.
 - **Q:** Why don't we instead learn from the Lechem Hapanim that they should be brought in groups of 12?
A: It makes more sense to compare them to the Todah in that they are both brought by individuals, are donated, have oil, become passul with linah, are not offered on Shabbos, and are not offered when tamei.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should compare them to Lechem Hapanim since they are both kodshei kodashim, require levonah, are matzah, and are brought on their own (not along with a korbon)? **A:** There are more ways in which they are similar to the Todah, and therefore we compare them to it.
 - **Q:** If we hold that something that was learned via a gezeira shava can then teach further via a banyan av, we should learn the other menachos from the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol, and they should also need to be brought in a group of 12!? **A:** The other menachos are more comparable to todah than they are to the chavitim, because like todah they are brought by common people, are donated, are not offered in halves, are subject to piggul, are not offered on Shabbos, and are not offered when tamei.
 - **Q:** Maybe they should be learned from chavitim, because they are similar to it in that they are both brought from an issaron of flour, are both placed in a kli shareis, both have levonah, are made of matzah, are brought on their own, require hagasha, and are put onto the fire of the Mizbe'ach. In fact, there are more ways that they are similar to chavitim than to todah!? **A:** The fact that the todah and the others are brought by common people is a more important characteristic, and therefore it is compared to todah.

R' MEIR OMER KULAN BA'OS SHTEIM ESREI

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If **R' Meir** holds that something learned via a gezeira shava can then teach further through a binyan av, he could learn the other menachos from the chavitim of the Kohen Gadol because there are more ways in which they are similar to it. If he holds that it can't teach further, he learns the other menachos from Lechem Hapanim, because he holds that the fact that they are both kodshei kodashim is a more important characteristic.

CHUTZ MILACHMEI TODAH UNEZIRUS SHEHEIN BA'OS ESER ESER

- The todah breads are written explicitly in the pasuk that they are to be brought in a group of ten. With regard to the nezirus breads, this is learned from the word "shelamav" written regarding the todah.
- **R' Tuvi bar Kisna in the name of Shmuel** said, if one baked the todah breads (there are 4 different kinds that are brought) as 4 challos (instead of 10 each he baked one each), he is yotzeh.
 - **Q:** We need 40 challos!? **A:** That is only needed l'chatchila.
 - **Q:** We need to separate a terumah from each type of bread, but if there is only one of each how can we do so? You can't say that he takes a piece from each of the 4 challos, because the pasuk of "echad" teaches that it can't be taken as a broken piece!? **A:** He takes the terumah while it is still dough.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, all menachos whose number of challos were increased or decreased are valid, except for the Lechem Hapanim, the chavitim of the Kohen Gadol, the todah breads, and the nazir breads. This contradicts **Shmuel**!? **A:** **Shmuel** holds like the **T"K** of another Braisa who says that even if the number of todah breads were increased or decreased it would be valid.
- **R' Huna** said, if a baked mincha was made as one challah, he is yotzeh. This is based on the pasuk that says "matzos", written without the "vuv".
 - **Q: R' Pappa** asked, if it would have been written with the "vuv" we would say that it would be passul? Regarding the todah breads the word "matzos" is written with the "vuv" and still **Shmuel** said that if they are baked as 4 challos it is valid!? **A: R' Huna** would argue with **Shmuel**.

MISHNA

- The Omer was brought of an issaron of flour sifted from 3 se'ah of barley. The Shte Halechem was brought of 2 issarons sifted from 3 se'ah of wheat. The Lechem Hapanim was brought from 24 issarons sifted from 24 se'ah.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is the Omer brought from so much barley? **A:** Since it is brought from the new produce (which has more chaff than older produce) and is brought from barley (as opposed to wheat), in order to get one issaron of high quality fine flour we must use 3 se'ah of barley.

SHTEI HALECHEM SHTEI ESRONOS MISHALOSH SA'IN

- Since it is from wheat, even though it is from the new crop, we only need 3 se'ah to produce 2 issaron of high quality fine flour.

LECHEM HAPANIM...

- Since this comes from wheat and from older produce, we can produce an issaron of high quality fine flour from just one se'ah of wheat.
- A Braisa says, if a mincha was offered with more than the required amount of issarons or less than the required amount, it is passul. If it had the proper amount of issaron, but was made from either more than the proper amount of se'ah or less than the proper amount, it is valid.

MISHNA

- The Omer was sifted through 13 sifters. The Shte Halechem was sifted through 12 sifters. The Lechem Hapanim was sifted through 11 sifters. **R' Shimon** says, there was not a set number of sifters to be used. Rather, when the flour was deemed to have been properly sifted, it was brought, as the pasuk says "v'lakachta soles v'afisa osah", which suggests that flour can be bought and offered as long as it has been properly sifted.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, the flour was put through a fine sifter, then a coarse sifter, then a fine one, then a coarse one. **R' Shimon ben Elazar** said, there were 13 sifters in the Mikdash, each one above the other (they were of graduated coarseness). The upper one takes out the bran and a lower one collects the soles flour.

R' SHIMON OMER LO HAYA LAHEN KITZVAH

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “soles v'afisa osah”, which teaches that the flour for the Lechem Hapanim is bought as fine flour that has already been sifted. The word “v'lakachta” in that pasuk teaches that they may also buy wheat and sift it themselves to make the soles flour. The word “osah” in the pasuk teaches that it is only the Lechem Hapanim for which the flour may be bought as flour, or may be bought as wheat and sifted into flour. This is to try and save the expense. However, all other menachos must be bought as soles flour.
 - **Q:** What is meant that this is allowed to save the expense? **A:** **R' Elazar** said, the Torah is concerned for the Yidden's money and therefore allows the purchase of wheat for the Lechem Hapanim.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK EILU MENACHOS NIKMATZOS!!!

-----Daf 77-----

PEREK HATODAH HUYSA BA'AH -- PEREK SHMINI

MISHNA

- The breads of the todah would come from flour in the amount of 5 Yerushalmi se'ah, which is 6 Midbar se'ah. This is the same as 2 eiphos, because each eipha is 3 se'ah. The two eiphos have 20 issaron of flour, of which 10 were used to make chametz loaves and 10 were used to make the matzah loaves. The ten used for the chametz resulted in one issaron per chametz loaf. The other 10 were used for the matzos, of which there were 3 types that were made for the Todah – challos, rekikin, and revuchah – ten loaves of each type of matzah were made. The result is that 3.33 issaron of flour was used for each type of matzah, which means that there were 3 matzos made from each issaron.
 - In the Yerushalmi measures, the 5 se'ah were equal to 30 kav. Fifteen kav were used for the 10 chametz loaves, resulting in 1.5 kav per loaf. The other 15 kav were used for the matzah loaves, which consisted of 10 loaves of 3 types – challos, rekikin, and revuchah, resulting in 5 kav used for each type, and two matzos being made from each kav.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that an eifah is 3 se'ah? **A:** **R' Chisda** said, the pasuk says “ha'eiphah v'habas tochen echad yihiyeh” (the eiphah and the bas have the same amount). This teaches that just as a bas is 3 se'ah, and eiphah is also 3 se'ah.
 - **Q:** How do we know that a bas is 3 se'ah? **A:** A pasuk says that a bas is one tenth of a kor, and we know that a kor is 30 se'ah.
- **Shmuel** said, we may not increase the size of a measure by more than a sixth, nor the value of a coin by more than a sixth, and one who sells basic necessities should not profit by more than a sixth.
 - **Q:** Why can't measures be increased by more than a sixth? If it is to prevent inflation, then even increasing a sixth should be assur as well!? It can't be that it is to prevent the transaction from being subject to ona'ah, because **Rava** has said that anything sold by measure, weight, or number, can be voided even if it is less than the amount of ona'ah!? It can't be so that a merchant who mistakenly sold it at the old weight will only lose a sixth, which is the amount of his profit, and not lose any principal, because not making any profit is itself considered to be a loss!? **A:** Rather, **R' Chisda** said, that **Shmuel** based this on a drasha of a pasuk from which he learns 3 things: the maneh of Hekdesh was double the regular maneh, we may increase measures but not by more than 1/6, and that the 1/6 is measured based on the new amount, not based on the original amount.
 - **Ravina** said, we see this from our Mishna as well, because the Mishna said that the breads of the todah would come from flour in the amount of 5 Yerushalmi se'ah, which is 6 Midbar se'ah.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

We see that we may increase a measure by $1/6$ that is measured based on the new amount, not the original amount.

MISHNA

- From each of the 4 types of breads the Kohen would take one of ten as terumah, as the pasuk says “v’hikriv mimenu echad mikol korbon terumah laHashem” – “echad” teaches that he should not take a broken loaf; “mikol korbon” teaches that each type of bread must have the same number of loaves and the Kohen should not take an extra of one type of bread instead of another type; “laKohen hazoreik es dam hashelamim lo yihiyeh” teaches that the remaining breads are eaten by the owners.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk of “v’hikriv mimenu” teaches that the terumah should come from all loaves when they are attached to each other (when they are all in the same keili); “echad” teaches that he should not take a broken piece; “mikol korbon” teaches that he should not take the terumah from one type for another type; “terumah laHashem” teaches that this means that one of 10 breads should be taken, just as terumah means 1 of 10 in regard to terumas maaser. Maybe we should instead say that just as the word terumah regarding bikkurim has no set amount, so too the terumah here has no set amount? We compare it to terumas maser, since it and the terumah taken of the todah have no terumah taken after this terumah is taken, and we don’t compare it to bikkurim which has terumah taken from all the produce that ripens after the bikkurim. Maybe we should compare it to bikkurim, since the todah breads and bikkurim must be eaten in Yerushlayim, whereas terumas maaser may be eaten anywhere? To address this uncertainty, the pasuk regarding todah says “mimenu...terumah laHashem” and the pasuk regarding terumas maaser says “mimenu terumah”, which creates a gezeira shava between the two.
 - The Braisa continues, we now know that the todah has 10 loaves of each type of bread, but we still don’t know how much flour is used to make each loaf. To teach this, we find the word “lechem” used regarding the todah and used regarding the Shte Halechem. This teaches that just as the Shte Halechem has an issaron of flour per loaf, the same is true for the todah challo. Maybe we should instead compare it to the Lechem Hapanim where the pasuk also says “lechem”, and should say that just as the Lechem Hapanim uses 2 issaron of flour per loaf, the same should be true for the todah? It makes more sense to compare the todah breads to the Shte Halechem breads, since these breads are both brought as an accompaniment to a korbon and are brought as chametz, whereas the Lechem Hapanim is not brought with a korbon and is not chametz. Maybe we should instead compare it to the Lechem Hapanim since the todah breads and the Lechem Hapanim breads may both be brought from produce of EY or of chutz laaretz, and may be brought from new grain or old grain, whereas the Shte Halechem may only be brought from the new grain grown in EY? The pasuk regarding the Shte Halechem has the extra word “tavi’u”, which teaches that any other chametz challo that are brought should be of the same amount of flour as the Shte Halechem – one issaron per loaf. Maybe we should say that since a total of 2 issaron are used for the Shte Halechem the same should be for the chametz breads of the todah? The pasuk says “tihiyena”, which teaches that a total of 10 issaron were used for the 10 chametz breads of the todah.
 - The Braisa continues, we now know that 10 issaron were used for the chametz breads of the todah. How do we know that 10 issaron were used for the matza loaves as well? The pasuk says “ahl challo lechem chametz”, which teaches that whatever is brought for chametz must also be brought for matzah. The result is that there are 20 issaron brought for the todah – ten used for chametz and ten used for matzah.
 - The Braisa continues, we would say that just as there is one type of chametz loaf there is also only one type of matza loaf and those matzah loaves should be made from the 10 issaron. The pasuk therefore lists 3 types of matzos – matzos belulos, rekikei matzos, and soles murbeches. The result is that there is 3.33 issaron for each type of matzah, and since there are 10 of each type, there are 3 matzos per issaron of flour.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Braisa concludes, that the result of all this is that there are 40 todah breads. Four of them (one of each type) is given to the Kohen and the remaining ones are eaten by the owners.
- **Q:** The Braisa said that “v’hikriv mimenu” teaches that the terumah should come from all loaves when they are attached to each other. Based on this, we should similarly say that when the pasuk regarding a chatas says “v’eis kol chelbo yarim mimenu” it means that the fats should be taken when attached. Attached to what? **A:** It is like **R’ Chisda** said in the name of **Avimi** that this teaches that the meat should not be cut up until the eimurim are removed,
- **Q:** The Braisa said that we learn from “terumah” written regarding terumas maaser. Why don’t we instead learn from the word “terumah” written regarding the spoils of Midyan, where the amount of the terumah was only 1/500!? **A:** We learn from terumas maser, because that is something that applies to all generations, as does a korbon todah, and we will not learn from the case of Midyan, which does not apply to later generations.
- **Q:** Why don’t we instead learn from “terumah” written regarding challah? **A:** **R’ Yishmael** taught a Braisa that said, that by terumas maaser and by todah the pasuk says “mimenu terumah laHashem”, and by challah it does not.
- **Q: Rava** asked, if a non-Kohen eats the terumah taken from the todah breads, would he be subject to death at the Hands of Heaven (for a meizid) and a chomesh (for a shogeg) or not? Since it is compared to terumas maaser we should say that he would be, or maybe the pasuk uses the exclusionary term of “vachamishiso”, which teaches to exclude the terumah of the todah breads? **TEIKU.**
- **Q:** The Braisa said that “tihiyena” teaches that a total of 10 issaron were used for the 10 chametz breads of the todah. How is this learned from “tihiyena”? **A:** **R’ Yitzchak bar Avdimi** said, the word is written with two “yuds”, one of which is extra, and therefore teaches that there are 10 issarons that are used.
 - **Q:** Maybe it refers to 10 of some other measurement? **A:** **Rava** said, the pasuk is discussing issarons.
- **Q:** The Braisa said that the pasuk of “ahl challos lechem chametz” teaches that whatever is brought for chametz must also be brought for matzah. The amount used for the chametz breads is itself learned through a hekesh, so how can that now teach further through another hekesh? We have learned that this may not be done!? **A:** The chametz breads are learned partly through their own pasuk and partly through a hekesh, therefore it is not considered to have been learned only through a hekesh and may teach further through another hekesh.
 - **Q:** What about according to the view that even when it is only learned partly through a hekesh it may still not be used to teach further through a hekesh? **A:** The amount used for the chametz breads is learned from the word “tavi’u”, not from a hekesh. Therefore, it can then teach further through a hekesh.

-----Daf פלג--78-----

MISHNA

- The “milu’im” korbon (brought when Aharon and his sons were installed as Kohanim) was also brought with breads, and these breads were like the matzah breads of a todah – they were of challos, rekikin, and revucha. The breads that accompany a korbon nazir are brought as two parts of the todah breads – challos and rekikin, but no revucha. Therefore, the nezirus breads were made of 10 Yerushalmi kav of flour, which equals 6 and 2/3 issaron.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that there was revucha brought with the milu’im (challos and rekikin are written explicitly in the pasuk)? **A:** **R’ Chisda in the name of R’ Chama bar Gurya** said, the pasuk makes reference to “challas matzah”, which refers to challos, it mentions “rekik echad”, which is the rekikin, but it also mentions “challas lechem shemen”. What does that refer to? It refers to the revucha (which had a lot of oil).
 - **Q:** **R’ Avya** asked, maybe it refers to a cake of gelled oil (and not bread at all)? **A:** Rather, the source is the drasha of **R’ Nachman bar R’ Chisda in the name of R’ Tavra**, who said that the pasuk creates a

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

hekesheh between the Kohen Gadol's daily minchas chavitin to a regular Kohen's mincha that he brings on the day that he begins to do the Avodah. This teaches that just as the chavitin are of revucha, the Kohen's mincha is as well. The Milu'im was a korban brought for the Kohanim beginning to do the Avodah, therefore it must be that it also included revucha.

- **R' Chisda** said, when a Kohen Gadol is installed to do the Avodah he must bring two revucha menachos – one for the daily Kohen Gadol chavitin and one for the inauguration into the Avodah. **Mar bar R' Ashi** said, he must bring 3 menachos.
 - The Gemara says that they do not argue. **R' Chisda** is talking about a case where this Kohen had done Avodah as a regular Kohen before becoming the Kohen Gadol and **Mar bar R' Ashi** is talking about where he never did the Avodah (he brings one as the daily chavitin, one for being initiated into the Avodah as any other Kohen, and one for being initiated as Kohen Gadol).

NEZIRUS HUUSA BA'AH SHTEI YADOS...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding todah says "shelamav", which comes to include the nazir's shelamim into the halachos of a todah, to teach that the 2 types of breads must be made of 10 Yerushalmi kav and ¼ lug of oil. We would think that it should even teach that a third type of bread (revucha) should be required as well. The pasuk regarding nazir therefore says "matzos".
 - **R' Pappa** explained, the word "matzos" teaches that only breads regarding which the pasuk says "matzos" are brought (and therefore revucha are not brought). The yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** taught a Braisa that says that "matzos" is a klal, "challos and rekikin" is a prat, and therefore, based on how we learn a klal uprat, the only things included are the challos and rekikin, and nothing else.

MISHNA

- If one shechts a todah in the Azarah while the breads are "outside the wall", the breads do not become kadosh. If the korban was shechted before the breads became crusted in the oven, or even if all the breads became crusted except for one, the bread does not become kadosh.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is meant by "outside the wall"? **A: R' Yochanan** says it means outside the wall of "Beis Pagi" (the wall surrounding Yerushalayim), and **Reish Lakish** says it means the wall of the Azarah. **Reish Lakish** holds that the pasuk says the challos must be offered "ahl" (with) the korban, and "ahl" means it must be close by. **R' Yochanan** doesn't darshen in this way and he therefore says it is valid as long as it is in Yerushalayim.
 - **Q:** They already argue about this elsewhere! A Mishna says, One who shechts the Pesach "over" chametz has violated a lav. **R' Yehuda** says the same applies to the shechting of the afternoon Tamid on Erev Pesach. On this Mishna **Reish Lakish** says, one would not be chayuv unless there is chametz owned by the one who slaughters, the one who does the zerika, or by one of the people of the ownership group of this Pesach, and the chametz must be present in the Azarah (based on the word "ahl"). **R' Yochanan** says the chametz need not be present in the Azarah. Why do they need to argue regarding the todah as well? **A:** If we only had the case of chametz we would say that **R' Yochanan** only holds that way there, because the issur of chametz exists no matter where the chametz is. However, regarding todah maybe he agrees to **Reish Lakish**. If we only had the case of todah we would say that **Reish Lakish** may agree with **R' Yochanan** regarding chametz.
 - There is a Braisa regarding todah that says like **R' Yochanan**.

SHACHTA AHD SHELO KARMU PANEHA BATANUR

- This is based on a Braisa. The Braisa says, "ahl challos lechem chametz yakriv korbano ahl zevach" teaches that the breads only become kadosh if they had already crusted in the oven. "Yakriv korbano ahl zevach" teaches that the breads only become kadosh with the shechting of the korban. "Zevach todas" teaches that if the korban was shechted not lishma, the breads do not become kadosh.
- A Braisa says, one can be yotzeh with partially baked matzah or with matzah made in a pan.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** What is partially baked matzah? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, it means that it is baked enough that if one were to break it, it would break cleanly, without strands of dough connecting the pieces. **Rava** said, the same is true for the breads of a todah (they must be baked to that level).
 - **Q:** It is obvious that the todah breads would be like the matzah, because they both are referred to as “lechem” in the pasuk!? **A:** We would think that since the pasuk regarding the todah bread says “echad”, it teaches that it may not be broken, and partially baked may be viewed as broken. He therefore teaches that partially baked is sufficient.
- If a todah was shechted over 80 loaves instead of the required 40, **Chizkiya** says 40 of them become kadosh and **R' Yochanan** says none of them become kadosh.
 - **R' Zeira** said, all agree that if he said at the shechita that 40 out of the 80 should become kadosh, they would become kadosh. All also agree that if he said that 40 should only become kadosh if all 80 become kadosh, none of them will become kadosh. The machlokes is where he said nothing. In that case, **Chizkiya** said that we view the additional 40 as being brought as achrayus and therefore 40 become kadosh, and **R' Yochanan** said that we view the additional 40 as the person wanting to bring an extra large korban with 80 loaves, and therefore none become kadosh.
 - **Abaye** said, all agree that we view the additional 40 as the person wanting to bring an extra-large korban with 80 loaves. The machlokes is whether a kli shareis can make something kadosh without the person's intent. **Chizkiya** holds that it does (therefore the 40 become kadosh even without his intent to do so) and **R' Yochanan** holds it does not (and since he never intended for only 40 loaves to become kadosh, nothing becomes kadosh).
 - **R' Pappa** said, all agree that a kli shareis can make something kadosh even without intent. The machlokes is whether the shechita knife, which is a kli shareis, can make the breads kadosh without intent. **Chizkiya** holds that it does, and **R' Yochanan** holds that since nothing is put inside this kli, it can only make something kadosh with intent.
 - **Others** say that **R' Pappa** said that all agree that a kli shareis can make something kadosh only with intent. The machlokes is whether the shechita knife, which is a kli shareis, is treated differently than other klei shareis. **Chizkiya** holds that it is superior to another kli shareis, as we see it can make something kadosh even though it has no inside to it. Therefore, it also has the ability to make something kadosh without intent as well. **R' Yochanan** says a knife is not treated differently than any other kli shareis and therefore it can only make something kadosh with intent.

-----Daf 79-----

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 Shavuot 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

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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**.
 - **Other** 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 korbon 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 korbon with accompanying breads.

MISHNA

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

GEMARA

- **Ze'iri** said that nesachim only become kadosh with the shechting of the korbon. This is based on the pasuk of "zevach unesachim".
 - **Q:** Our Mishna is presumably discussing where the korbon 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 Shte 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.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Chisda** has said that if oil has been designated for a korbon mincha, it may not be used for another korbon. How can the Mishna say that the nesachim can be used for another korbon? **A: R' Yannai** said, Beis Din stipulates regarding the nesachim of korbanos tzibbur that if they are needed for the korbon they are used for it, and if they are ultimately not needed for it, the nesachim may be used for another korbon.
 - **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 korbon may be used for another korbon even without a stipulation? **A: Matisya ben Yehuda** taught that the case is where the nesachim are used for another korbon that has already been shechted. Therefore, people will think it belonged to that korbon all along.
 - **Q:** This would mean that if there is no other korbon 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 korbon, that is only if there is another korbon that has already been shechted, but if there is no other korbon shechted there the nesachim may not be used with another korbon!? **A:** That is essentially what the Mishna is saying. It is saying that if there is no other korbon that is shechted there at that time, the nesachim are treated as if they were passul 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 korbon 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 korbon? 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 korbon doesn't need breads only if the owner already got his kapparah through the original korbon. However, if he had not gotten that yet, the surplus korbon would require breads.
 - **Q: R' Amram** asked, which type of surplus is he referring to? He can't be teaching about a replacement korbon, because the Braisa already taught that if it is brought first it needs breads

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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 korbon, 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 korbon 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 korbon, it requires breads. If it is offered after the initial korbon, it does not require breads.

-----Daf 80-----

- **Shmuel** said, in any case that a chatas would have to be left to die, in the corresponding case of a todah the korbon would not require the accompanying breads. In any case that a chatas would be left to graze and get a mum, the corresponding case of todah would require the accompanying breads.
 - **Q: R' Amram** asked, the Braisa quoted earlier said, 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. Now, in the corresponding case of chatas this animal would be left to graze, as we see in a Mishna. The Mishna says, in a case where a chatas animal was lost, a replacement was designated, and the original animal was found before the replacement was shechted, **Rebbi** says, one animal is offered as a chatas and the other is left to die, and the **Rabanan** say, a chatas is only left to die if the owner has received a kapparah with another animal. If a kapparah was not yet had, the animal would be left to graze. We see that according to the **Rabanan** the replacement is left to graze and yet in the corresponding case of todah the accompanying breads would *not* be brought!? **A: Shmuel** holds like **Rebbi**, who says that if the animal is still lost when the replacement is designated, the animal is left to die.
 - **Q:** What would be the case of a chatas left to graze according to **Rebbi**? **A:** The case would be like **R' Oshaya** says, that if a person brings two animals for a chatas – one for the chatas and one for achrayus, he may use whichever one he wants and the other is left to graze.
 - **Q:** The corresponding case of todah would *not* require the accompanying breads to be brought, so this would not fit with the second part of **Shmuel's** statement!? **A: Shmuel** holds like **R' Shimon**, who says that when one animal is used for a chatas, the other animal is always left to die.
 - **Q: R' Shimon** never holds that the animal is left to graze, so how can that fit with **Shmuel's** statement? **A: Shmuel** actually only said the first part of the statement – that in any case that a chatas would have to be left to die, in the corresponding case of a todah the korbon would not require the accompanying breads. His point is to teach that he doesn't hold like **R' Yochanan**, who says that a person can fulfill his obligation with the offspring of hekdesch. **Shmuel** teaches that this is not the case.
- **R' Abba** said, if a person designates an animal for a todah and designates the accompanying breads, if the breads were then lost he can bring replacement breads, but if the animal is lost he may not bring

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

another todah to accompany the breads. The reason is that the breads are an accompaniment to the korbon, but the korbon is not an accompaniment to the breads.

- **Rava** said, if one designates money to buy a todah and there was money left over after purchase of the animal, he may use the remaining money to purchase the breads. If he designated money for the breads and there was left over money, he may not use that money for purchase of the todah.
 - The Gemara explains that the breads are referred to as “todah” (and therefore money designated for the todah may be used for the breads) but the todah is not referred to as “breads” (and therefore money designated for the breads may not be used for the todah).
- **Rava** also said, if a person obligated himself to bring a todah and separated an animal for this todah and this animal was then lost, and he then separated a replacement animal and it too was lost, and he then separated another replacement animal, and the first two animals were then found, so that all 3 animals are now available, if he uses the first animal for his obligation, the second animal is brought without breads (it is a replacement for a todah which wasn’t used for the obligation, which the Braisa said is brought without breads) but the third is brought with breads (it is considered to be a donated todah). If he brings the third animal for his obligation, the second animal is brought without breads, but the first animal is brought with breads. If he brings the second animal for his obligation, both of the others are brought without breads. **Abaye** said, no matter which one is brought, the other two do not require breads, because they are all considered to be replacements for the other.
 - **R’ Zeira** said, the same is true for chatas. If an animal was separated for his chatas and this animal was then lost, and he then separated a replacement animal and it too was lost, and he then separated another replacement animal, and the first two animals were then found, so that all 3 animals are now available, if he uses the first animal for his obligation, the second animal is left to die and the third is left to graze and get a mum. If he brings the third animal for his obligation, the second animal is left to die and the first is left to graze and get a mum. If he brings the second animal for his obligation, both of the others are left to die. **Abaye** said, no matter which one is brought, the other two are left to die, because they are all considered to be replacements for the other.
 - **Q:** It seems obvious that this would be the case for chatas based on the rule that we gave above for todah!? **A:** We would have thought to say that regarding a todah it is possible to say that the person means to bring another donated todah, and maybe that is why the first and the third animals are considered to be disconnected from each other. However, regarding chatas we would say that they are connected to each other in all cases. **R’ Zeira** therefore teaches that the case of chatas is like the case of todah.
- **R’ Chiya** taught a Braisa that says, if a todah became mixed with its temurah (and we don’t know which one is which), and one of the animals then died, the remaining animal has no remedy to be offered. We can’t offer it with breads, because maybe it is the temurah, which must be offered without breads. We can’t offer it without breads, because maybe it is the todah, which must be offered with breads!
 - **Q:** What is the case of the Braisa? If he obligated himself to bring a todah (“harei alai”) he must bring another animal to fulfil his obligation, so he can bring another animal with breads and stipulate that if the remaining animal is really the todah the breads should be for it, and if the remaining animal is really the temurah then the breads are for the new todah he is now bringing!? **A:** The case is where he said “harei zu”, without undertaking a personal obligation. Therefore, he cannot bring a new animal as achrayus for the initial animal.
 - **Q:** The ones who learned in front of **Rebbi** (Rashi says this refers to **Levi**) said, why can’t he bring breads and say, if the remaining animal is a todah, here are the breads, and if it is the temurah, the breads should be chullin? **A: Rebbi** said, he can’t do that, because it is assur to bring chullin into the Azarah.
 - **Q:** Why can’t he bring another animal and breads and stipulate that if the remaining animal is the temurah, the new animal should be a todah with the breads, and if the remaining animal is the todah then these are the breads and the new animal should be a shelamim? **A: Rebbi** said, doing so would

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

limit the allowable time of eating the Shelamim (which can normally be eaten for 2 days, but would now have to be eaten for only one day in case it is truly a todah), which can unnecessarily lead to nossar.

- **Q: Levi** asked **Rebbi**, why can't he bring another animal and breads and stipulate that if the remaining animal is the temurah, the new animal should be a todah with the breads, and if the remaining animal is the todah then these are the breads and the new animal should be a leftover todah (which is supposed to be brought without breads)? **A: Rebbi** said, I am surprised that **Levi** would suggest such an answer. We cannot bring an animal as a "leftover" ("leftover" is what happens to offspring of a korban or to a replacement that is not needed, one cannot make something "leftover" in the first instance)!
- **Q: R' Yitzchak bar Shmuel bar Marsa** said to **R' Nachman**, why can't he bring another animal and breads and stipulate that if the remaining animal is the temurah, the new animal should be a todah with the breads, and if the remaining animal is the todah then these are the breads and the new animal should be a temurah? **A: R' Nachman** said, one who makes temurah gets malkus! Should we say that he may go ahead and make temurah for this purpose!?

-----Daf נד--81-----

- A Braisa had said that if a todah became mixed with its temurah (and we don't know which one is which), and one of the animals then died, the remaining animal has no remedy to be offered. We can't offer it with breads, because maybe it is the temurah, which must be offered without breads. We can't offer it without breads, because maybe it is the todah, which must be offered with breads. The Gemara has offered a number of possible solutions to be able to offer the remaining animal, but each solution has been rejected. The Gemara continues to offer possible solutions.
 - **Q: When Abaye and the Rabanan** went to visit **R' Eila** they said, according to **R' Yochanan** who says that if the todah breads are outside the Azarah when the todah is shechted, the breads still become kadosh, we can give the following solution. The owner can bring breads and put them outside the Azarah and stipulate that if the remaining animal is the todah, these should be its breads, and if it is not the todah, these breads should remain chullin. He can then go and shecht the remaining animal!? **A: This won't work**, because there must be a tenufah done to the 4 loaves taken as terumah by the Kohen. This tenufah cannot be done outside the Azarah, because the pasuk says it must be done "lifnei Hashem". The breads cannot be brought into the Azarah, because there is an issur to bring chullin into the Azarah. Therefore, this solution is not feasible.
 - **Q: R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** asked, according to **Chizkiya**, who says that when a todah is shechted with 80 loaves only 40 of them will become kadosh, the owner should be able to do the following. He should bring another animal and 80 loaves of bread. He should say, if the remaining animal is the todah, this new animal is also a todah and here are the 80 breads that are needed for both animals, and if the remaining animal is the temurah, this new animal is a todah and these are its breads, and then let 40 out of the 80 become kadosh!? **A: This is not a viable solution**, because this shortens the allowable time for eating these breads that are possibly todah breads.
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asked **R' Kahana**, according to **R' Yochanan**, who says that if one designated a pregnant animal for his chatas and the animal gave birth, he has a choice to bring his chatas either from the designated animal or from the offspring, we can propose the following solution. The owner should bring a pregnant animal as a todah and wait for it to give birth. Then he should bring 80 breads and stipulate as follows – if the remaining animal is temurah, then this new animal and the offspring should both be todos and here are their 80 breads, and if the remaining animal is a todah, then this new animal is also a todah and the 80 breads are for these two todos, and the offspring is a leftover from a todah and is offered without breads!? **A: R' Kahana** said, it may be that even according to **R' Yochanan** the offspring may be used in the place of its mother, but not as a new, independent offering. Therefore, it cannot be that the mother and the offspring both need breads.
 - **Q: R' Dimi the son of R' Huna of Hamdurya** said to **Ravina**, maybe the owner should bring an animal and obligate himself ("harei alai") to bring a todah. He should then bring 80 loaves along with yet another animal and stipulate as follows – if the remaining animal is the temurah, then these two new animals

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

are todos and here are their 80 breads, and if the remaining animal is the todah, then the first new animal is also a todah and here are the 80 breads for these two todos, and the second new animal is brought as achrayus (which does not need to be offered with breads)!? **A: Ravina** said, the pasuk teaches that one should not make nedarim, so therefore we can't use this solution since it would require the person to make a neder to bring a todah.

MISHNA

- If a person says “harei alai todah”, he must bring the todah and the breads from chullin (he may not use maaser, because he has created a personal obligation).
- If he says, “I obligate myself to bring a todah from chullin and its breads from maaser”, he must bring the todah and the breads from chullin (the breads are an accompaniment to the todah and therefore when he obligated himself to bring the todah from chullin, that automatically includes the breads as well).
- If he says, “I obligate myself to bring a todah from maaser and the breads from chullin”, he must do as he said.
- If he says, “I obligate myself to bring a todah and its breads from maaser”, he should do as he said. However, he should not bring the breads from wheat of maaser sheini, rather he should use money of maaser sheini to purchase them.

GEMARA

- **R' Huna** said, if a person obligated himself to bring “todah breads”, he must bring a todah and the breads. The reason is, that a person knows that he can't offer only breads and therefore certainly meant to obligate himself to bring the todah and the breads. The reason he only mentioned the breads is that he only stated the second half of the statement.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna said that if a person said, “I obligate myself to bring a todah from maaser and the breads from chullin”, he must do as he said. Now, according to **R' Huna** why don't we say that we look at the final part of the statement and require him to bring the todah from chullin as well? **A:** This case is different, because we view the second part of the statement as a stand-alone statement as if he said that he will bring breads to accompany someone else's todah (which is an allowable thing to do). Therefore, it can be viewed independently and is treated as such.
 - **Q:** If so, why in the case of the Mishna where the person said, “I obligate myself to bring a todah from chullin and its breads from maaser”, must he bring the todah and the breads from chullin? Let us view this as someone who is bringing a todah to satisfy someone else's bread obligation and therefore only the todah should have to be brought from chullin!? **A:** One can bring bread to satisfy a todah obligation, but there is no concept of bringing a todah to satisfy a bread obligation.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if someone obligates himself to bring a todah without breads, or to bring a korbon without nesachim, we force him to bring the todah and the breads, or the korbon and the nesachim. This implies that if he had only obligated himself to bring todah breads we would not force him to bring a todah along with it!? **A:** If he said only “todah breads” he would have to bring a todah along with it. The reason the Braisa did not give that case is because it could not also say the parallel for the case of nesachim (that if he obligates himself to nesachim he must also bring the korbon, because one may actually bring nesachim without a korbon).
 - **Q:** When a person obligates himself to bring a todah without breads, or to bring a korbon without nesachim, why don't we view the second part of his statement as a retraction of his promise to bring the korbon (since he knows that a todah cannot be brought without breads and that a korbon cannot be brought without nesachim)? **A: Chizkiya** said, this Braisa follows **B”S** who say that when a person makes a contradictory statement, we follow the first part of the statement. **R' Yochanan** said the Braisa can even follow **B”H**, because the Braisa may be talking about a case where the person then said, had I known that I must bring breads I would have added that to my promise. The reason the Braisa says that we force him to bring the breads is that the case is that the person then wanted to retract his promise.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says that if a person obligates himself to bring a todah without breads, or to bring a korbon without nesachim, we tell him that he must bring the breads and the nesachim. If he says, “Had I known I would not have made this neder”, we force him to bring the breads or nesachim anyway. This fits well according to **Chizkiya**. Even **R’ Yochanan** would say that this Braisa must follow the view of **B”S**.

HEE V’LACHMAH MIN HAMMASER YAVI

- **Q:** The Mishna seems to say that he should bring the korbon from maaser. Why couldn’t he bring it from chullin if he chooses? **A: R’ Nachman and R’ Chisda** said, the Mishna means to say that if he *wants* to, he may bring the korbon and the breads from maaser.

V’LO YAVO MEICHITEI MAASER SHEINI...

- **R’ Nachman and R’ Chisda** said, this means that he should not use actual wheat of maaser sheini, but he may use wheat that was purchased with money of maaser sheini.
- **R’ Yirmiya** said to **R’ Zeira**, he may not bring the todah from wheat of maaser sheini, but may use wheat that was purchased with money of maaser sheini. **R’ Zeira** said, I say that even wheat that had been purchased with money of maaser sheini may not be used (rather, he can use money of maaser sheini to buy wheat specifically for the breads). **R’ Zeira** said, I will give your reason and my reason. Your reason is that we learn that a todah may be purchased with maaser sheini from the case of shelamim, and shelamim is learned via a gezeira shava of “sham” from maaser, and you say that just as the shelamim is something purchased with money of maaser sheini and is not maaser sheini itself, the same must be done for the todah. I say that just as a shelamim is not from a species of maaser sheini, the same must be for a todah. Therefore, if there is wheat that was purchased with money of maaser sheini it is considered to be of a species of maaser sheini and may not be used for a todah. What must be done is for the money to be used specifically for wheat for the todah. In that way, it is considered to be a todah, and not a species of maaser sheini.

-----Daf כב---82-----

- **R’ Ami** said, if a person designates maaser sheini money to purchase a shelamim, it is ineffective (it does not get kedushas shelamim). The reason is, that the kedushas shelamim is not strong enough to take effect on top of the kedushas maaser that is already there.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, that if one uses maaser sheini money to buy a chaya for a shelamim (a chaya is not valid to be brought as a korbon), the animal’s skin does not become chullin (rather its value must also be used to buy a proper animal for a shelamim). This seems to show that kedushas shelamim does take effect on something that had kedushas maaser!? **A:** The Mishna is explained by **Rav** to mean that no kedushas shelamim at all takes effect on the animal.
- We have learned, if one designates money of maaser sheini for a shelamim, **R’ Yochanan** says the money gets kedushas shelamim and **R’ Elazar** says that it does not. Now, according to **R’ Yehuda**, who says that maaser money is considered to be the property of the owner, all would agree that the money gets kedushas shelamim. The machlokes is according to **R’ Meir**, who says that maaser money is considered to be the property of Hashem – **R’ Elazar** says that since it is not the person’s money it cannot get kedushas shelamim, and **R’ Yochanan** says that since one may buy a shelamim with maaser sheini money, the money will take on the kedushas maaser.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if one designated maaser sheini money for a shelamim and then needs to redeem the coins (to switch them to smaller coins), he must add two fifths – one for redeeming kodashim and one for redeeming maaser sheini. We clearly see that kedushas shelamim does take hold!? **A:** The Braisa only follows the view of **R’ Yehuda**.

MISHNA

- How do we know that if one obligates himself to bring a todah he must bring it from chullin? The pasuk says “v’zavachta pesach laHashem Elokecha tzon uvakar”. Now a Korbon Pesach may only be brought from lambs and goats, not from cattle, so why does the pasuk say “tzon uvakar”? This creates a hekesh from the korbanos that are brought from cattle to a Pesach and teaches that just as a Korbon Pesach is an obligatory korbon and

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

must be brought from chullin, so too any other obligatory korban must be brought from chullin. Therefore, if someone says “harei alai todah” or “harei alai shelamim”, since the korban is now obligatory, it must be brought from chullin.

- In all cases, nesachim must be brought from chullin.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that Korban Pesach must be brought from chullin? **A:** A Braisa says, **R' Eliezer** says, the pesukim discuss the Korban Pesach of Mitzrayim and the Korban Pesach for future generations. This teaches that just as in Mitzrayim it had to be brought from chullin (there was no such thing as maaser sheini at that time), the future Korbanos Pesach also had to be brought from chullin. **R' Akiva** asked him, how can you learn something that is possible (it is possible to bring the Korban Pesach of future generations from maaser sheini money, since maaser sheini exists) from something that is not possible? **R' Eliezer** said, even though it was impossible, it still can be used as a great proof that we can learn from. **R' Akiva** said, the Pesach of Mitzrayim is very different in that its blood and eimurim were not offered on the Mizbe'ach, and maybe that is why it had to be brought from chullin!? **R' Eliezer** said, the pasuk says “v'avadita es ha'avodah hazos bachodesh hazeh”, which teaches that all the avodos of this month of Nisnon should always be the same. This teaches that the later Pesachim must be like the Pesach of Mitzrayim and must be brought from chullin.
 - **Q:** If **R' Akiva** really holds that we can't learn something that is possible from something that is not possible, then why is he giving another reason? If he retracted from that logic, and he now holds that we can't learn out all future Pesach from Pesach of Mitzrayim because in Mitzrayim the blood and eimurim didn't go on the Mizbe'ach, then we can refute that by saying that the Pesachim brought in the Midbar were offered on the Mizbe'ach and yet they were only brought from chullin (there was still no maaser sheini at the time)!? **A:** **R' Akiva** remains with his original logic. However, he is saying that even according to you (**R' Eliezer**) who holds that we can learn something that is possible from something that is impossible, the reason you still can't learn from Pesach Mitzrayim is because it was not offered on the Mizbe'ach. **R' Eliezer** responded with the pasuk.
 - **Q:** Why didn't **R' Eliezer** respond by saying that the Pesach of the Midbar refutes that (as explained above)!? **A:** **R' Eliezer** is saying, according to me we can learn from Pesach Mitzrayim, because we can learn something that is possible from something that is impossible, and for the question that Pesach Mitzrayim was not offered on the Mizbe'ach we can answer by saying that the Pesach of the Midbar refutes that. According to you (**R' Akiva**) who says that we may not learn something that is possible from something that is impossible, I will show you that we can learn from the pasuk that all avodos of the month of Nisnon are to remain the same.
 - **Q:** Why can't **R' Akiva** say that the pasuk only teaches regarding aspects that were possible in Mitzrayim as well, but not regarding the requirement that it come from chullin? **A:** **R' Sheishes** said, from here we see that we may not ask on a hekesh based on logic.
 - **Q:** **R' Eliezer** darshened a hekesh from Pesach Mitzrayim to Pesachim of future generations. The Mishna then taught that there is a hekesh between Pesach and all other korbanos. How can something that is learned via a hekesh then teach further via a hekesh!? **A:** The connecting of future Pesachim to that of Mitzrayim teaches that the entire group of all Korbanos Pesachim are the same. The Mishna then learns a hekesh from all other korbanos to the entire group of Korban Pesach. Therefore, it is not considered to be a hekesh which is then taught further using another hekesh.