



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

Menachos Daf Yud Daled

- The Gemara continues its discussion.
 - **Q:** How can you say the Braisa follows the view of **Rebbi**? Whose view of our Mishna did **Rebbi** follow? If he follows the **Rabanan**, then even an intent regarding eating a kezayis of one of the challos creates piggul!? If he follows **R' Yose**, who says that piggul intent regarding one thigh does not make the other thigh piggul, then how could he say that a piggul intent regarding a kezayis of the two challos together makes them piggul!? **A:** Rather, the Braisa follows the view of the **Rabanan**. The Braisa does not mean that it does not become piggul until there is intent on both of the challos, rather it means that there must be a piggul intent regarding both of the lambs. This comes to exclude the view of **R' Meir**, who says that piggul can be created from an intent on half of a matir (the two lambs together are a matir).
 - **Q:** If so, what does the Braisa mean when it says that piggul is “never” created unless there is an intent regarding both of them? Now, if we say that the Braisa means that the piggul intent must be regarding both challos and both lambs, and it follows the view of **R' Yose** (who says that intent regarding one challah does not make the other one piggul), we can say that this comes to exclude the view of **R' Meir** (that intent on one lamb suffices) and the view of the **Rabanan** (that the intent on one challah suffices). However, if the Braisa follows the view of the **Rabanan** and only comes to exclude the view of **R' Meir**, what is meant by “never”? If so, we are back to the original question – if **R' Yose** holds, as **R' Huna** said, that piggul intent regarding one thigh does not make the other one piggul, how can he say that a kezayis of the two challos together can create piggul!? Also, **R' Ashi** said, a Braisa says, **Rebbi in the name of R' Yose** said, if (regarding the korbanos that are offered on the inside Mizbe'ach) he had a piggul intent regarding something that is done outside the Heichal, it becomes piggul. If he had an intent regarding something that is done inside the heichal, it is not piggul. For example, if he was standing outside the Heichal and said that he is shechting with intent to apply the blood beyond its time, it is not piggul, because this is an intent outside regarding something done inside. If he was standing inside and said that he is applying the blood with the intent to offer the eimurim or pour the leftover blood the next day, it is also not piggul, because this is an intent inside regarding something to be done outside. However, if he was standing outside and shechted with intent to pour the leftover blood the next day or to offer the eimurim the next day, it would be piggul because it is an intent had outside regarding something done on the outside. Now, with regard to the intent to pour the leftover blood the next day, what will it cause to become piggul? It can't be the blood (meaning that a person who eats the blood will be chayuv kares) because a Mishna says that blood cannot become piggul! Rather, it means that it makes the meat piggul. Now, if when having intent on the blood **R' Yose** holds that it makes the meat piggul, surely if he has an intent on one thigh it would make the other thigh piggul!? Furthermore, **Ravina** said, the Mishna says, if the Kohen takes the kemitza with intent to eat the shirayim or to burn the kometz the next day, **R' Yose** agrees that it is piggul and there is a chiyuv kares on it. Now, what does the intent to burn the kometz the next day make piggul? It can't mean that it makes the kometz piggul, because a Mishna says that a kometz cannot become piggul. Rather, it means that the shirayim become piggul. Now, if in the case where he did not have an intent about the

shirayim itself, **R' Yose** says it becomes piggul, then in the case where he had piggul intent regarding the meat itself (one thigh) it certainly makes all of the meat (even the other thigh) piggul!? **A:** Rather, **R' Yochanan** said, that the reason for the view of **R' Yose** is that the pasuk treats the two challos as one unit and the pasuk also treats them as two units – they are considered as one unit in the sense that they are essential to each other and one can't be brought without the other, and they are considered as two units in that they are prepared separately. Therefore, if a person combined them in his intent, they are treated as one, but if he separated them they are considered to be separate.

- **Q: R' Yochanan** asked, what if one had a piggul intent for one set of the Todah breads? Do the other sets become piggul as well? What if one had piggul intent for one category of breads of a baked mincha? **A: R' Tachlifa** of EY taught a Braisa that in these cases there is the same machlokes between **R' Yose and the Rabanan**.
- A Braisa says, if during shechita he intends to eat a half kezayis beyond its time and during the zrika he has a similar intent, it is piggul, because shechita and zrika combine.
 - Some say that this is only true for shechita and zrika, since they are both matirin, but would not be true for kabbalah and holacha. Others say that if shechita and zrika, which are far apart (they are the first and last of the Avodos) combine, then certainly kabbalah and holacha will combine.
 - **Q: Levi** taught a Braisa that said that none of the Avodos can combine to make piggul!? **A: Rava** said, the Braisa that says they can't be combined follows **Rebbi** and the Braisa that says that they can be combined follows the **Rabanan**. We see this in the Braisa where **Rebbi** says that if there is intent during the shechita of each lamb to eat half a kezayis of one of the challos beyond their time, it is a valid korbon. We see that he holds that they don't combine for piggul.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, maybe **Rebbi** holds that way there, because the intent involves half of a matir (one lamb) and half of the amount necessary to be eaten. However, if the intent to eat half the amount was made during an entire matir he may say that it does combine!?
 - **Q: Rava bar R' Chanan** asked **Abaye**, if **Rebbi** holds that when there is an entire matir it does combine, then in the case of the half matir he should be goizer that it should be passul out of concern for the case of where it was a complete matir!? We find that **R' Yose** makes such a gezeira and the **Rabanan** make such a gezeira!? **A: Abaye** said, **R' Yose and the Rabanan** are goizer in cases where there is a specific similar case that necessitates us to be goizer. However, the case of **Rebbi** does not require us to be goizer, because there will never be a case where one of the lambs will act as the entire matir, and therefore there will never be a similar case of actual piggul.