



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

Menachos Daf Gimmel

- The Gemara said that **R' Shimon** says that menachos are different than animal korbanos, meaning that although a mincha brought for the sake of another mincha can be fully valid (even to count for the obligation of the owner) an animal korbon brought for the sake of another korbon will never be valid to that extent (because the avodah of animal korbanos are the same for all korbanos – they all have shechita, kabbalah, etc.).
 - **Q:** The Gemara asks, that kodshei kodashim that were shechted in the north of the Azarah for the sake of kodshei kalim should be fully valid, because the fact that they are shechted in the north shows that they are not kodshei kalim!? **A:** Kodshei kalim may *even be* shechted in the south, but they may certainly be shechted in the north as well, and therefore the shechita in the north does not show that he is shechting kodshei kodashim.
 - **Q:** If kodshei kalim are shechted in the south for the sake of kodshei kodashim they should be fully valid, because if they were truly kodshei kodashim they would have to be shechted in the north!? **A:** People will say that they are truly kodshei kodashim and he is just being over the requirement to shecht it in the north. Therefore, it is not obvious that it is kodshei kalim.
 - **Q:** If this is true, then the same should be said when a machavas mincha was offered for the sake of a marcheshes mincha? Why do we say that since he is using a machavas keili it is obvious that it is a machavas? Maybe say that it is truly a marcheshes and he is over the requirement to bring it in a marcheshes keili!? **A:** The case of mincha is different, because a Mishna says, even if he made a neder to bring a marcheshes and then brought it in a machavas, or visa-versa, the korbon has the status of a mincha of the keili in which it was brought, and he has not fulfilled his neder. Therefore, if it is brought in a machavas and the Kohen says it is for a marcheshes, it is obvious that it is a machavas and the intent is given no effect.
 - **Q:** That Mishna continues and says that if instead of making a neder, a person says “this flour” should be a brought in a machavas and he then brought it in a marcheshes, or visa-versa, the korbon is passul. Based on this, if the owner said “this flour”, the Kohen’s intent for the other mincha should make it passul, so why does **R' Shimon** say that the intent is meaningless!? **A:** The Mishna is following the view of the **Rabanan**, but **R' Shimon** would actually hold that even in this case the mincha becomes the type of mincha of which it is actually brought, and the Kohen’s intent is meaningless.
 - **Q:** If an olah is shechted for the sake of a chatas it should be fully valid, because the olah is only brought from male animals whereas a chatas is brought from females and the Kohen’s intent is therefore obviously false and should be meaningless!? **A:** There is the chatas of the Nasi which is a male goat, and therefore the intent is not obviously false.
 - **Q:** What if he brings an olah “for the sake of a chatas of an individual” (which can only be brought from females)? Furthermore, if a chatas of an individual is shechted for the sake of an olah it should be fully valid, since the fact that a female animal is used it shows that it cannot be an olah!? **A:** The animal’s tail blocks people from being able to tell the gender of the animal, and therefore the intent is not obviously false.
 - **Q:** That is true when a sheep is used, because it has a tail that can do that. What about when a goat is used? In that case the Kohen’s intent is

obviously false!? **A:** Rather, people can't easily tell the gender of an animal, and therefore the intent is not obviously false.

- **Q:** A Pesach that was shechted for the sake of an asham should be fully valid, because a Korbon Pegasch must be in its first year and an asham must be in its second year!? **A:** An asham metzora and an asham nazir are brought when in their first year, and that may have been what the Kohen was referring to. Therefore it is not valid.
 - **Q:** What if he said that it is for the sake of an asham gezeilos or an asham me'ilos, which must be in their second year? Furthermore, if he shechts an asham gezeilos or asham me'ilos for the sake of a Pesach it should be fully valid!? **A:** Rather, people don't recognize the age of the animal, because there are younger animals that look older and visa-versa.
- **Q:** If a goat is shechted for the sake of an asham (which must be a sheep) it should be fully valid, since a goat does not have wool and a sheep does (and the intent is therefore obviously false)!? **A:** People will think that the goat is a black ram, which can be brought for an asham.
- **Q:** If a calf or a par is shechted for the sake of a Pesach or an asham it should be fully valid, because such animals can't brought for a Pesach or an asham!? **A:** These korbanos would actually be fully valid. When **R' Shimon** said that animal korbanos are never fully valid when they are brought for the sake of another korbon, he meant that *most* animal korbanos are like that, but there are exceptions.
- The Gemara had posed a contradiction – in one Braisa **R' Shimon** said that a mincha offered not lishma is fully valid and in another Braisa he said that it does not count to fulfil the owner's obligation. **Rava** now answers that in the first Braisa **R' Shimon** is referring to where the Kohen did the kemitza for the sake of another mincha and since the pasuk says "v'zos Toras hamincha" all menachos are considered to have the same halachos, whereas in the second Braisa he is referring to where the kemitza was done for the sake of an animal korbon.
 - **Q:** **R' Shimon** gave his reasoning as being that the avodah of each mincha is distinct and the wrong intent is therefore obviously false. He did not base his view on a pasuk!? **A:** **R' Shimon** means to say, even though the avodah is obviously false, which would be a bigger reason to say that the korbon is passul, since the pasuk says "v'zos Toras hamincha" it remains valid. This is not true for animal korbanos. Even though their avodos are the same, still there is no pasuk that equates them all.
 - **Q:** If so, when one chatas is brought for the sake of another chatas (e.g. a chatas brought for the aveira of cheilev is brought for the sake of the aveira of eating blood) it should be fully valid based on the pasuk of "v'zos Toras hachatas"!? **A:** According to **R' Shimon** these chatas would be valid.
- **R' Ashi** answered the contradiction between the Braisos by saying that the first Braisa is referring to where he did the kometz of a machavas for a marcheshes, and the second Braisa is where he did the kometz of a minchas machavas for the sake of a minchas marcheshes. In the first case he is stating his intent for the type of keili, and that does not make a korbon passul. In the second case he is offering it for a different type of korbon, and that does effect the validity of the korbon.
 - **Q:** **R' Shimon** gave his reason as being that the avodah shows what type of korbon he is actually bringing. This would seem to be giving a reason why it is fully valid even when he intends for the sake of another "mincha"!? **A:** **R' Shimon** means to say, even though the intent is obviously false and the mincha would therefore seem to be passul, since the intent was for a type of keili rather than for a type of mincha, the korbon remains fully valid.
 - **Q:** **R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, if the Kohen offers a "dry mincha" for the sake of a "mixed one" (one mixed with a lot of oil), he is clearly not offering it for a type of keili, and therefore **R' Shimon** should say that it is passul!? **A:** Since he doesn't say it is for the sake of another "mincha" we assume that he meant it was for the sake of some other mixture, and therefore it remains fully valid.
 - **Q:** If so, if an olah is brought for the sake of a shelamim, **R' Shimon** should say it is fully valid, because we should similarly assume that he intends for "the sake of shalom"!? **A:** That case is different, because the korbon itself is called a

shelamim. In the case of the mincha, the korbon itself is not called a “mixed one” it is called “mixed with oil”.

- **Rava and R' Ashi** don't answer the contradiction as **Rabbah** did, because they say that an intent that is obviously false is more of a reason to say that the korbon is passul. **Rabbah and R' Ashi** don't say like **Rava**, because they don't darshen the “zos Toras” in that way. **Rabbah and Rava** don't answer like **R' Ashi**, because they are bothered by the question of **R' Acha the son of Rava**.
- We find that **R' Hoshaya** actually asked this matter of machlokes between **Rabbah and Rava**. He asked, what would **R' Shimon** say if a mincha was brought for the sake of an animal korbon? Is his reasoning based on the fact that the intent is obviously false and therefore this is no different and the korbon would be valid, or is his reasoning based on “v'zos Toras hamincha”, and since this is offered for the sake of an animal korbon it would be passul? He did not follow **Rabbah** because of **Abaye's** question on him. He did not follow **Rava**, because he felt that if we darshen “v'zos Toras hamincha” in that way we should also darshen “v'zos Toras hachatas” in that way and we do not find that **R' Shimon** holds that way in all respects. He does not hold like **R' Ashi** because of the question of **R' Acha the son of Rava**.