



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

### Menachos Daf Yud Gimmel

#### PEREK HAKOMETZ ES HAMINCHA -- PEREK SHEINI

##### MISHNA

- If a Kohen does the kemitza with intent to eat the shirayim or to burn the kometz the next day, **R' Yose** would agree that the korbon becomes piggul and there is a chiyuv kares for someone who eats it. If the kemitza is done with intent to burn the levonah the next day, **R' Yose** says it is passul but there is no kares, and the **Chachomim** say it is passul and there is kares. The **Chachomim** said to him, why is this different than an animal korbon (where if the animal is shechted with intent to burn the eimurim the next day, the korbon would certainly become piggul and one would be chayuv kares)? The same should be with the mincha!? **R' Yose** said, the difference is that the blood, meat, and eimurim are all considered to be one thing, whereas the levonah is not considered to be part of the mincha.

##### GEMARA

- **Q:** Why did the Mishna need to say the first case and say that in that case **R' Yose** agrees? **A:** If we would only give the second case where he says it is passul and there is no kares, we would say that **R' Yose's** reasoning is based on that he holds that an intent on half of the matir cannot create piggul. Therefore, we would say that in the first case as well it would not become piggul, because it is also regarding half a matir (since the intent did not include the levonah). The Mishna therefore teaches that in the first case he agrees that it becomes full piggul.

##### L'HAKTIR LEVONASAH L'MACHAR R' YOSE OMER PASSUL V'EIN BO KARES

- **Reish Lakish** said, **R' Yose** would say that one matir cannot effect piggul on another matir (e.g. an intent on the levonah during the kemitza of the kometz will not make it piggul). The same should be said regarding the two spoons of levonah on the Shulchan (they are both matirin).
  - **Q:** Why is it necessary to state that the same applies to the two spoons of levonah? **A:** We would have thought to say that **R' Yose** holds the way he does when there is an intent on the levonah during the avodah on the kometz, because the kometz and the levonah are of different kinds. However, regarding the two spoons of levonah, where they are both of the same kind, maybe they can effect piggul on each other. **Reish Lakish** therefore teaches that they do not.
    - **Q:** The Mishna suggests that **R' Yose's** view is based on the fact that the levonah and the kometz are of different kinds, because **R' Yose** explains that the mincha is different than the blood, meat, and eimurim of an animal, because those different parts of the animal are considered to be one thing, whereas the levonah is not the same as the mincha itself!? **A:** What **R' Yose** means when he says this is that the levonah is not subject to the same restrictions as the mincha. As long as the kometz is not burned, the shirayim may not be eaten. However, even if the kometz is not burned, the levonah may still be burned.
    - The **Rabanan** argue and hold that we only say that a matir can't effect piggul on another matir when the two are not placed into a single kli shareis. The mincha and the levonah are put into a single kli shareis and therefore they are considered to be one and the same.
- **R' Yannai** said, if the levonah was gathered by a non-Kohen, it is passul.
  - **R' Yirmiya** explained this is because he has moved the levonah closer to the Mizbe'ach and he has therefore done holacha. This would be considered a holacha, because **R' Yannai** holds that holacha does not need to involve movement of the feet and holacha done by a non-Kohen is passul.

- **R' Mari** said, we can see this from our Mishna as well. The Mishna says that the kemitza, putting it into a keili, carrying it to the Mizbe'ach, and burning it are all avodos. Now, the kemitza is like a shechita. The carrying it is like holacha. The burning it is like the zrika. What avodah is the putting it into a keili? It is not like kabbalah, because the blood flows into a keili on its own, whereas the flour must be put into the keili! Rather, we must say that since this must be done, it is an important avodah, and therefore it must be considered like a kabbalah. Similarly, with regard to gathering the levonah, we must say that since this must be done, it is an important avodah, and therefore it must be considered like a holacha.
  - The Gemara says this is no proof. Putting the flour into the keili is like kabbalah. The fact that kabbalah of blood is different because it happens on its own does not make a difference, and therefore the putting of the flour into the keili is a true kabbalah. However, gathering the levonah is not similar to holacha, and would therefore not be considered a holacha.

#### MISHNA

- If the two lambs that accompany the Shte Halechem on Shavuot were shechted with intent to eat one of the challos the next day, or if one burned the levonah of the Shulchan with intent to eat one of the arrangements of the Lechem Hapanim on the next day, **R' Yose** says, that challah or that arrangement which was the subject of the intent is piggul and there is a chiyuv kares and the other one is passul but does not carry kares. The **Chachomim** say that both of them are piggul and carry kares.

#### GEMARA

- **R' Huna** said, **R' Yose** would say that if there was piggul intent regarding the right thigh of an animal, the left thigh does not become piggul. We can say this is based on logic – just as if one thigh became tamei, the other would not become tamei (when they have been separated), so the same is with regard to piggul. We can also say that this is based on a pasuk that says “v'hanefesh ha'oches *mimenu* avono tisah” – piggul is for the one who eats *it*, but not for the other limb.
  - **Q: R' Nachman** asked **R' Huna**, a Braisa says that there is only piggul on the second challah of the Shte Halechem if there was intent regarding *both* challos, even if there was intent to eat a combined kezayis of the two of them beyond their time. This implies that if there was only intent regarding one of the them, the other would not become piggul. Who does this Braisa follow? It can't be the **Rabanan**, because they say that intent regarding only one of them makes the other passul! Rather, it must follow **R' Yose**. Now, if we say that the limbs of an animal are considered to be one unit, it would make sense to say that the two challos are also considered to be one unit. However, if you say that even the limbs are not one unit, how can we say that the two challos are considered to be one unit!? **A:** The Braisa follows the view of **Rebbi** in a Braisa. The Braisa says, if one shechts the first lamb with intent to eat half a kezayis of one challah beyond its time, and shechts the second lamb with intent to eat half a kezayis of the other challah beyond its time, **Rebbi** says that it would be valid. This suggests that this is because he said “half a kezayis”. However, had he said “a kezayis from both challos” it would have combined for piggul. Based on this, the previous Braisa can be following this view of **Rebbi**.