



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the halachos and different cases of a mincha that is brought not for its own sake.

### 2) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara explains the significance of the word **ללא** in the Mishnah.

It is noted that the Mishnah that rules that a mincha that is not brought for its own sake counts for the owner is inconsistent with R' Shimon's position that the owner has discharged his obligation.

The Gemara then clarifies that the Mishnah could be reconciled with R' Shimon's position according to R' Ashi, but Rabbah and Rava must say that the Mishnah is inconsistent with R' Shimon.

### 3) R' Shimon's position

A contradiction between two rulings of R' Shimon is noted.

Rabbah reconciles the contradiction.

Abaye unsuccessfully challenges this answer.

Rabbah's explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

Another challenge to Rabbah's explanation is presented. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Which mincha is invalid if it is not performed for their own sake?  
 -----
2. Why is the same korban referred to as a **נדב** and a **נדבה**?  
 -----
3. What opinion of R' Shimon is at odds with our Mishnah?  
 -----
4. When is a mincha like a chatas or an asham?  
 -----

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *The essence of improper intent*

כשרות אלא שלא עלו לבעלים לשם חובה

**W**hen the kohen who officiates for a mincha has a thought of the offering “not being for its sake”, this results in the mincha being kosher, and the kohen may continue to offer it, but its owner who brought it will not receive credit for his having brought his obligation. The Achronim discuss the meaning of this lack of intent on the part of the kohen. Some say that the offering is lacking the necessary component of being brought for its proper purpose. Although the conclusion of the Gemara (2b) is that the kohen's not having any intent is acceptable, this is because we can assume that an offering is being brought for its sake unless we know otherwise. The lack of a clear statement of intent allows the offering to be assumed to remain “for its sake.” Nevertheless, if the kohen specifically declares that he is bringing this offering for a purpose other than for what it was intended to be, his declaration directly removes our assumed understanding, and the offering is being brought “not for its sake.” This approach is found Chidushei R' Aryeh Leib, and in Kehilas Yaakov (in Zevachim #2).

The Gri”z (to Rambam, Ma’ase HaKorbanos 4:11), however, explains that the Gemara's conclusion that an offering is understood to be for its sake even without intent means that as long as the owner designated this mincha for a particular purpose, the offering is acceptable even if intent on the part of the kohen who officiates is lacking. This element of **לשמה** remains present as long as the intent of the owner and his designation of the offering has not been removed. Nevertheless, if the kohen then adds intent for the offering to be for a different purpose, we learn from the verses brought in Zevachim 4a that this element of **לשמה** takes effect, and the offering is disqualified in terms of allowing the owner to fulfill his obligation. In other words, the **לשמה** of the owner which is still present is now overshadowed by a disqualifying factor, much like the disqualification of piggul.

One difference between these two approaches can be where the kohen wishes to correct his original statement of improper intent — for example, if the kohen collected the blood having in mind the wrong type of offering. If the problem is simply improper intent, if there is still blood available from the neck of the animal, the kohen can collect more blood, and this time have proper intent for the correct offering. If, however, the problem is that the original improper intent causes a disqualification of the offering, similar to the thought of piggul which causes the offering to become invalid, this situation cannot be remedied by further attempts to

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Reading Shema twice

הא מנחה גופה כשרה ואסור לשנויי

*But the Mincha itself is valid and it is prohibited to further deviate*

One is obligated to have proper intent when reading the verse of שמע ישראל and if one does not have the proper intent the mitzvah is not fulfilled. Shulchan Aruch writes that one who did not have the proper intent must repeat the verse<sup>1</sup>. The problem is that it is prohibited to repeat the verse of שמע ישראל since it gives the appearance as though one is addressing two deities<sup>2</sup>. Poskim offer a number of solutions to this dilemma. One option is to say the verse quietly. Another option is to wait a little bit before repeating the verse since the prohibition applies only when one repeats the verse immediately after the first time that he recited the verse. Another possibility is to continue reading until that first paragraph is completed and then read it a second time.

Teshuvos Torah L'shmah<sup>3</sup> wonders whether a person who will read the remainder of the paragraph with the intent to then repeat it is obligated to read it the first time with all of the care and precision that accompanies reading Krias Shema to fulfill the mitzvah. Perhaps since one does not intend to fulfill the mitzvah with this reading it is no different than

*(Insight...continued from page 1)*

include proper intent with more blood.

Kovetz Shiurim (2:22) notes that according to Gri"z, we can understand why an intent for its sake together with intent not for its sake results in the offering being disqualified. ■

reading words of Torah which do not require the care and precision of one who fulfills the mitzvah of Krias Shema.

He answered that one is required to exercise the same care and precision during the first reading even though he no longer intends to fulfill his mitzvah with that reading, and he bases his conclusion on our Gemara. The Mishnah taught that if the kemitzah was taken not for its own sake the mincha is valid but the owner has not discharged his obligation. Rava adds that although the owner does not discharge his obligation the remaining procedures should be done with the correct intent. This clearly indicates that even though the owner does not fulfill his obligation and is obligated to offer another korban, nevertheless, he must still follow all the associated halachos as though he is fulfilling his obligation. The same principle applies to Krias Shema. Even though this reading will not discharge one's obligation for Krias Shema, nevertheless, one must exercise the same care and precision as though he was fulfilling the mitzvah. ■

1. עי שו"ע או"ח סי' ס' סעי' ה' וסי' ס"ג סעי' ד'.
2. שם סי' ס"א סעי' ט'.
3. שו"ת תורה לשמה סי' ל"ב. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## All of Menachos

"כל המנחות..."

Many people, especially those training to be sofrim, often learn the segment of Menachos which deal with tefillin, leaving the rest of the tractate for another time.

But the Kotzker Rebbe, zt"l, maintains that this is a big mistake. "One who wishes to learn hilchos tefillin should not jump to Perek HaTecheiles and learn the relevant dappim. Instead, he must begin at the beginning of Maseches Menachos with perek Kol HaMenachos, and continue straight through until he gets to the relevant dappim.

"One who fails to learn this tractate in order will not be able to clarify the halachos sufficiently. Chazal placed hil-

chos tefillin in the middle of the tractate because tefillin have a deep connection with the menachos offerings. It follows that one must learn Menachos to properly comprehend hilchos tefillin!"<sup>1</sup>

Obviously, this does not refer to the simple meaning of the halachos since the halachos of tefillin are quite singular and have their metaphysical structure, quite apart from hilchos korbanos. But the following explanation of menachos sheds light on their connection with hilchos tefillin.

Many are discouraged to hear that tefillah without kavanah is compared to a body without a soul. When Rav Yisrael of Shklov, zt"l, discussed this with Rav Chaim Volozhiner, zt"l, the latter offered a very novel approach.

He said, "It is true that prayer without kavanah is like a body without a soul, but that doesn't mean that it doesn't

count at all. Our sages teach that our prayers are compared to sacrifices. But that is only if they are intoned with kavanah. If they are said without focus they are not likened to a korban hatamid which has a life force. Instead, they are likened to menachos which are a poor man's sacrifice which is still precious."<sup>2</sup>

Tefillin are mainly worn during keriyas Shema and tefillah since they help us internalize that we are all intrinsically bound to Hashem. When we focus on this we are sure to daven with kavanah. It is not so hard to understand why an analysis of the halachos of korbanos and menachos in our mesechtah—which allude to various types of prayer—is a prerequisite to understanding the halachos of tefillin which adorn prayer. ■

1. ארץ צבי, סוכות תרפ"ט, עי קמ"ד.
2. מעשה רב החדש, הלכות קריאת שמע ותפלה, אות י"ב. ■