



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

### Menachos Daf Beis

### MESECHTA MENACHOS

### PEREK KOL HAMENACHOS -- PEREK RISHON

#### MISHNA

- All menachos whose kemitza was done not lishma, are valid but don't count for the owner to fulfil his obligation, except for a chatas mincha and a sotah's mincha, which become passul when they were done not lishma.
- If a chatas mincha or a sotah's mincha had their kemitza done not lishma, or if the kometz was put into a kli shareis not lishma, or was brought to the Mizbe'ach or burned on the Mizbe'ach not lishma, or if any of these were done lishma and not lishma, or not lishma and lishma, they become passul.
  - What is the case of "lishma and not lishma"? If he did the avodah for the sake of the chatas mincha and for the sake of a minchas nedavah. What is the case of "not lishma and lishma"? If he did the avodah for the sake of a minchas nedavah and for the sake of a chatas mincha.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** Why did the Mishna say "except" that they do not count for the obligation of their owners? Why couldn't it just say, they are valid "but" they do not count for the obligation of their owners? **A:** The Mishna is teaching that they don't count for the obligation of their owners, but they remain in their original state of kedusha, and therefore it would be assur to make any more changes during the remaining parts of the Avodah (e.g. all intent must be for the sake of this korbon).
  - This is as **Rava** said, that if an Olah is shechted not for its sake, it is still assur to offer its blood not for its sake. We can say this is based on logic and we can say it is based on a pasuk. The logic would be – just because there was one change that was made improperly, does that mean that we should go ahead and make more improper changes!? The pasuk would be "motza sifasecha tishmor v'asisa kasher nadarta laHashem Elokecha nedava..." The pasuk refers to the korbon as a neder and then as a nedava – this doesn't make sense!? Rather, the pasuk is teaching that if the korbon was brought properly, it will be considered a fulfillment of the obligation of the owner. If not, it will not fulfil the obligation, but will still be treated as a nedava. Now, it is not mutar to make improper changes to a nedava!
- **Q:** Maybe we must say that our Mishna does not follow the view of **R' Shimon** from a Braisa where he says that a korbon mincha that had the kemitza done for the sake of a different type of korbon mincha is valid and fulfils the obligation of the owner. The reason is that each type of mincha is noticeably different than the other (different methods of making the mixture) and therefore intent for something else won't make it passul, since we can clearly see what was actually offered. This is different than animal korbanos where the shechita, kabbalah, holacha, and zrika are the same by all. Now this is not a problem according to **R' Ashi** who explains a contradiction between **R' Shimon** in this Braisa and in another Braisa which says like our Mishna (that the mincha would be passul), that this Braisa is discussing where the Kohen does the kemitza of a machavas (a type of mincha) for the sake of a marcheshes (another type of mincha) and therefore it is valid, but the other Braisa is discussing where he does the kemitza of a "minchas machavas" for the sake of a "minchas marcheshes" (he mentions "mincha") in which case it is passul. Based on this we can say that our Mishna is also discussing where he mentioned

“mincha” and that is why even **R’ Shimon** holds it is passul. However, according to **Rabbah and Rava** (who answer the contradiction between the Braisos in other ways), it seems that they would have to say that our Mishna does not follow **R’ Shimon**!?! You can’t say that our Mishna can be reconciled with **R’ Shimon** according to **Rabbah** in the same way that he reconciles the Braisos, that this Braisa is discussing a case where the intent was not lishma but was instead for a different korbon, whereas the other Braisa was discussing where it was not lishma for that owner (and that is why it is passul), and then say that our Mishna is also discussing where it was intended for a different owner, because our Mishna is clearly talking about not lishma for that korbon, but rather for a different korbon (as it gives the example for what is meant by “lishma” and “not lishma”)!?! You also can’t say that our Mishna can be reconciled with **R’ Shimon** according to **Rava** in the same way that he reconciles the Braisos, that this Braisa is discussing a case where the not lishma intent was the taking of a kometz for a different type of mincha whereas in the other Braisa the intent was that he took the kometz for the sake of an animal korbon (and that is why it is passul) and then say that our Mishna is also discussing where it was intended for the sake of an animal korbon, because our Mishna is clearly talking about where he intended for another mincha (as can be seen from the example that it gives)!?! **A:** Rather, we must say that according to **Rabbah and Rava** our Mishna does not follow the view of **R’ Shimon**.

- **Q:** The Gemara has just referenced a contradiction between Braisos of the view of **R’ Shimon**. The Gemara now discusses this in detail. There is a Braisa where **R’ Shimon** says, the pasuk regarding a mincha that says “kachatas ka’asham” compares a mincha to a chatas and compares a mincha to an asham. This teaches that there are some menachos that are like a chatas and some that are like an asham – the chatas mincha is like a chatas and therefore if the kemitza is done not lishma it becomes passul, and the minchas nedava is like an asham and therefore if the kemitza is done not lishma it is still valid. Now this would seem to say further that it is like an asham in that it is valid but does not count for the owner’s obligation. This contradicts **R’ Shimon’s** view in the Braisa quoted earlier!?! **A: Rabbah** answers that the earlier Braisa is referring to where the avodah was done with intent for another type of mincha (and since it is plainly visible what type of mincha is being offered the intent is meaningless and the mincha is fully valid) whereas this second Braisa is referring to where the intent was for a different owner and that is why it is not fully valid.
  - **Q: Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, the fact that a mincha becomes passul based on improper intent is based on a hekesh, so why should there be a difference if the improper intent was regarding the type of mincha or the wrong owner? In either case it should be passul based on the hekesh!?! **A: Rabbah** said, **R’ Shimon** (as he does elsewhere) darshens the reasoning behind the pasuk, and therefore says that the pasuk only makes the improper intent passul when it is not obvious that the intent is improper. However, when it is intended as a different type of mincha, which is obviously not proper, it would not make the korbon passul.
  - **Q:** Based on this (that an intent for something that is obviously improper does not make the korbon passul), a bird olah whose melika was done above the line marking the halfway point of the Mizbe’ach should be fully valid (even if the Kohen did so for the sake of a chatas) since only the melika of an olah is done above the line, whereas the melika for a chatas would be done below the line!?! **A:** The melika of a chatas can be done above the line as well. It is only the blood applications that must be done below the line. Therefore, if he did the melika of an olah for the sake of a chatas, it would not count for the owner’s obligation.
  - **Q:** If the blood of an olah bird was squeezed above the line for the sake of a chatas, it should be fully valid, since only the application of an olah bird’s blood is applied above the line!?! **A:** The blood of a chatas bird is first sprinkled (and that *must* be done below the line) and the remainder is then squeezed. This squeezing of the remainder may be done even above the line. Therefore, the squeezing of the olah blood above the line does not necessarily show that it must be an olah.
  - **Q:** If the blood of an chatas bird was sprinkled below the line for the sake of an olah, it should be fully valid, since only the application of a chatas bird’s blood is

applied below the line, and only the blood of a chatas bird is sprinkled (the blood of an olah is squeezed)!? **A: R' Shimon** would actually hold that in this case the chatas would be fully valid. In fact, **R' Shimon** says that this concept (that its actions can sometimes be an obvious contradiction to the intent and thereby render the intent as meaningless) applies only to menachos "because menachos are not comparable to animal korbanos". He specifically says this would not apply to animal korbanos, which means that he would agree that this concept does apply to bird korbanos.