

Menachos – Simanim

פרק א – כל המנחות

דף ב – 2 Daf

1. Most *menachos* whose *kemitzah* was performed are valid, and the remaining *avodah* must be *leshma*

The first Mishnah begins: כל המנחות שנקמצו שלא לשמן כשירות – *all menachos whose kemitzah was performed not for its sake are valid*, אלא שלא עלו לבעלים לשם חובה – *except that they do not count for the owner's obligation*. [A *menachah* and a *sotah's minchah* are invalid when performed *leshma* (שלא לשמה).] The Mishnah's language implies that *it is prohibited to make more changes* (שלא לשמה). As Rava taught, if an *avodah* was *shechted* לשמה, one may not do its *zerikah* לשמה. This can be derived logically: *just because he changed it* (by performing its first *avodah* לשמה), *should he keep changing it* [with the later *avodos*]?! Alternatively, this can be derived from a *passuk*: כאשר נדרת לה' אלקיך נדבה – *like you vowed to Hashem, your G-d, a donation*. These contradictory terms of *נדר* and *נדבה* teach that if one *shechted* his *korban* לשמה, it counts for his *נדר*, but if not, היא נדבה – *it will be a nedavah* (an additional, donated *korban*). And is it permitted to make changes to a *nedavah*? Since a *nedavah* must certainly be brought לשמה, so too if a sacrifice was begun לשמה, its remaining *avodah* must likewise be performed לשמה.

2. Rebbe Shimon holds *menachos* with *kemitzah* count for obligations, because *me'aseh mo'achin*

In a Baraisa, Rebbe Shimon says that *menachos* (including *menachah* חוטא) whose *kemitzah* was performed are valid, and they do count for the owner's obligation. He explains that *menachos* are different from *korbanos* (where one does not fulfill his obligation with *avodah* לשמה), because if one does *kemitzah* on a *menachah* מחבת (fried on a flat griddle) for the sake of a *menachah* מרחשת (fried in a deep pan), *its makeup demonstrates that it is actually being prepared for a machavas*. Similarly, if *kemitzah* of a *chriyba* – *dry minchah* is performed for the sake of a *bilula* – [*minchah*] mixed with oil, *its makeup demonstrates that it is being prepared for a dry [minchah]*. In contrast, *korbanos* have no distinctions indicating which type of *korban* is being sacrificed: *there is only one type of shechitah for all of them*, and only one זריקה and קבלה for all of them. The Gemara discusses whether our Mishnah can agree with Rebbe Shimon, depending on the different explanations of his opinion.

3. Rabbah: Rebbe Shimon validates *menachos* with *shinui* בשינוי בעלים

In the above Baraisa, Rebbe Shimon says a *minchah* whose *kemitzah* was performed is fully valid and counts for his obligation. This is contradicted by another Baraisa, in which Rebbe Shimon explains that the Torah says a *minchah* is “like a חטאת and like an אשם” to teach that a *menachah* חוטא is like a חטאת, and disqualified לשמה, while a *menachah* נדבה is like an אשם, and valid לשמה, and like an אשם, it would not fulfill the owner's obligation!? Three answers are given, the first of which appears on this Daf. Rabbah answers: [the first Baraisa] is with a change of “holiness,” i.e., intent for a different *type* of *minchah*, and Rebbe Shimon rules that since it is readily apparent that his intent is false, it is disregarded, and the *minchah* is completely valid. [the second Baraisa] is with a change of owner, i.e., intent for one person's *minchah* to be for someone else's sake; since there is no indication from the *minchah* that his intention is false, it can invalidate the *minchah*. Rebbe Shimon is דריש טעמא – *expounds the reason of the Torah's laws*, and says here that *Hashem* only invalidated sacrifices brought with an intention which is not recognizable as false.

Siman – House

When the Kohen brought a *minchah* brought לא לשמה to the *Minchah House* covered in flour and was told it was valid but does not fulfill the owner's *chiyuv*, a Rabbi objected and said that it does since it's clear that it was brought as a *menachah* מרחשת and not מחבת, unlike the *minchah* of a Kohen he turned away where the *kemitzah* was done with *shinui* בשינוי since the intention is not recognizable as false.



When the Kohen brought a *minchah* brought לא לשמה to the Minchah **House** covered in flour and was told it was valid but does not fulfill the owner's *chiyuv*, a Rabbi objected and said that it does since it's clear that it was brought as a מנחת מרחשת and not מחבת, unlike the *minchah* of a Kohen he turned away where the קמיצה was done with בעלים since the intention is not recognizable as false.

3 things to remember

1. Most menachos whose קמיצה was לא לשמן are valid, and the remaining avodah must be לשמה
2. Rebbe Shimon holds מנחות with מעשיה מוכיחין count for obligations, because מנחות שלא לשמן
3. Rabbah: Rebbe Shimon validates מנחות שלא לשמן with שינוי קודש לאו בשינוי בעלים

