



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

Menachos Daf Yud Beis

MISHNA

- If the Kohen does kemitza on a mincha with the intent to eat the leftover flour outside the Azarah, or to eat a kezayis of the leftover flour outside the Azarah, or to burn the kometz outside the Azarah, or to burn a kezayis of the kometz outside the Azarah, or to burn the levonah outside the Azarah, the mincha becomes passul but there is no kares. However, if he does the kemitza with intent to eat the leftover flour the next day, or a kezayis of it the next day, or to burn the kometz the next day, or a kezayis of the kometz the next day, or to burn the levonah the next day, it is piggul and one would be chayuv kares for eating it.
 - The general rule is, anyone who does the kemitza, or puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach, with an intent to eat something that is meant to be eaten or to burn something that is meant to be burned – if the intent is to do so beyond its proper place, it becomes passul but there is no kares for eating it; if the intent is to do so beyond its proper time, it becomes piggul and there is kares for eating it, as long as the “matir” (the kometz) is offered as it is supposed to be.
 - What is meant that the matir is offered as it is required to be? If he did the kemitza without saying anything (without a bad intent) and he then puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach with intent for beyond its time, or if he did the kemitza with intent for beyond its time and then puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach without any bad intent, or if he did the kemitza, puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach all with intent for beyond its time, this would be a case where the matir was offered as required.
 - What is meant that the matir is not offered as it is required to be? If he did the kemitza with intent for beyond its allowable place and then puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach with intent for beyond its time, or if he did the kemitza with intent for beyond its allowable time and then puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach with intent for beyond its allowable place, or if he did the kemitza, puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach with intent for beyond its allowable place (while doing the other 3 with piggul intent), or in the case of a chatas mincha or sotah's mincha, if he did the kemitza not for its sake and then puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach with intent for beyond its time, or if he did the kemitza with intent for beyond its time and then puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach with intent not for its own sake, or if he did the kemitza, puts the kometz into a kli shareis, or brings it to the Mizbe'ach, or burns it on the Mizbe'ach not for its own sake, these would be cases of where the matir was not offered as it is required to be.
 - If the Kohen intended to eat a kezayis beyond its allowable place and then intended to eat a kezayis beyond its time, or visa-versa, or he intended to eat a half of a kezayis beyond its allowable place and then intended to eat a half kezayis beyond its time, or visa-versa, the korbon will be passul, but there will not be kares if the korbon is then eaten. **R' Yehuda** says the general rule is, if the intent regarding beyond its time precedes the intent for beyond its

allowable place, the korbon becomes piggul and there is kares. If the intent for beyond its allowable place precedes the intent for beyond its time, the korbon is passul and there is no kares. The **Chachomim** say, that in either case the korbon is passul and there is no kares.

GEMARA

- **Q:** According to the view that if the leftover flour (the “shirayim”) becomes deficient between the taking of the kometz and the burning, the kometz is still burned, and we have established that this shirayim is assur to eat, what is the halacha regarding whether the burning of the kometz will be effective to establish the shirayim as piggul (e.g. if he had in mind to eat the shirayim after its proper time) and to remove them from being subject to me’ilah? **A: R’ Huna** said, even according to **R’ Akiva** who says that zrika is effective to remove me’ilah from a korbon that has left the Azarah, that is because it is still in existence and is only passul because of an external factor. However, regarding the shirayim that has become deficient, which is passul on its own account, the burning of the kometz will not be effective in removing the me’ila issur.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, we should say exactly the opposite! Even according to **R’ Eliezer** who says that zrika does not help to remove me’ila from korbanos that have left the Azarah, that is only regarding korbanos that have left the Azarah, since they are not in the Azarah for the zrika to be effective on them. However, regarding the shirayim that has become deficient, which is inside the Azarah, the burning of the kometz should be effective to remove the issur of me’ila from it!? **Rava** said, I can prove this from our Mishna which said that if the Kohen does the kemitza to eat the shirayim outside the Azarah or a kezayis of the shirayim outside the Azarah, it is passul. **R’ Chiya** taught a similar Braisa that left off the case of “or a kezayis”. Now, why would he have left out that case? Presumably, it is because the case of the Braisa even includes where the shirayim was deficient to the point that there was only a kezayis left. Still, the Mishna says that in this case an improper intent would create piggul and would create a chiyuv kares. We see that the burning of the kometz can establish the shirayim as piggul and could therefore also remove me’ilah, even if the shirayim is deficient!? **A: Abaye** said, this is not the proper way to understand the Braisa. It may be that the Braisa follows the view of **R’ Elazar**, who says in a Mishna that one is not chayuv for offering a kezayis of a kometz outside the Azarah. Rather, he would only be chayuv if he offered the entire kometz outside the Azarah. Since, according to his view the Braisa could not have given the case of “or a kezayis of the kometz outside”, it also did not give the case of a kezayis of the shirayim.
 - **Q:** The Braisa can’t follow **R’ Elazar**, because he says in a Mishna that the burning of the kometz without the levonah is not valid, and the Braisa gives the case of the burning of the kometz alone!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to the kometz of the chatas mincha, which does not have levonah brought with it. In fact, we find that **R’ Dimi in the name of the Amora R’ Elazar** also said that the Braisa is referring to the kometz of the chatas mincha and follows the view of the Tanna **R’ Elazar**.
 - **Rava** later retracted what he said (rather, the burning of the kometz on the Mizbe’ach will not effect shirayim that have become deficient). He based this on a Braisa which he said must follow **R’ Akiva** and implies that a kometz of a mincha has no effect on shirayim that is deficient. **Abaye** said, the Braisa can be understood as following the view of **R’ Eliezer**, and that is why the kometz has no effect on shirayim that is deficient. However, it may be that according to **R’ Akiva** the kometz would have an effect on shirayim that is deficient.

MISHNA

- If the Kohen intended to eat half of a kezayis of the shirayim the next day and to burn half a kezayis of the kometz the next day, the mincha is valid, because an intent for eating and for burning do not combine to create the minimum required amount of a kezayis.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna suggests that the reason the two intents don't combine is that one intent was for eating and the other was for burning. However, in the similar case of eating a half kezayis of something that is meant to be eaten and eating another half kezayis of something that is not meant to be eaten it would combine. Now, the earlier part of the Mishna specifically said that the intent only makes it passul when he intends to eat something that is meant to be eaten or burns something that is meant to be burned!? **A: R' Yirmiya** said, this later part of the Mishna is the view of **R' Eliezer**, who argues on the **Rabanan** in a Mishna and says that when an intent is made to eat something that is meant to be burned, or to burn something that is meant to be eaten, beyond its place or time, it does make the korbon passul. **A2: Abaye** said, that this later part of the Mishna can even be following the view of the **Rabanan**, and the inference from the Mishna is not that an intent to eat something that is not meant to be eaten combines, but rather that if he intends to eat half of a kezayis and then another half of a kezayis of something that is meant to be eaten, they combine.
 - **Q:** According to **Abaye**, what is the chiddush? The earlier parts of the Mishna teach that intents to eat things that are meant to be eaten combine, and we can also learn from there that if only things that are meant to be eaten combine, certainly intents for eating and burning do not combine, so what is this part of the Mishna coming to teach? **A:** The Mishna is teaching that intents for eating and burning do not combine. We would not be able to learn this from the fact that intents for eating something that is meant to be eaten and to eat something that is not meant to be eaten do not combine, because we would say that those don't combine because it involves an intent to do something that is not the normal way of doing it. However, an intent to eat something that is meant to be eaten and an intent to burn something that is meant to be burned should combine because they are both an intent to do something that is meant to be done. Therefore, the Mishna needs to teach that these intents also do not combine.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL HAMENACHOS!!!