



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

Menachos Daf Tes Vuv

MISHNA

- If one of the two challos of the Shte Halechem or one of the two arrangements of the Lechem Hapanim became tamei, **R' Yehuda** says both challos or arrangements must be taken out to be burned, because a korbbon of the tzibbur is not divided. The **Chachomim** say that the tamei one is tamei and the tahor one may be eaten.

GEMARA

- **R' Elazar** said, the machlokes is where they became tamei before the zrika (of the animals, or the burning of the levonah). However, if they became tamei afterwards, all would agree that the tamei one is tamei and the tahor one may be eaten.
 - **Q:** What is the point of machlokes in the case where it became tamei before the zrika?
A: R' Pappa said, the machlokes is whether the tzitz brings acceptance for the parts of a korbbon that are eaten – the **Rabanan** say that it does and **R' Yehuda** says that it does not.
 - **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Nosson** asked **R' Pappa**, we see from a Braisa that they even argue regarding the parts of the korbbon that are burned on the Mizbe'ach, so that cannot be the basis of their machlokes!? Further, **R' Ashi** said, a Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says that if even one Shevet is tamei, they may all bring the Korbbon Pesach in tumah, because a korbbon of the tzibbur is not divided. Now this has nothing to do with the tzitz providing acceptance, and yet he says his ruling. We see that his ruling has nothing to do with the tzitz!? Further, **Ravina** said, if the reason of **R' Yehuda** is based on the tzitz, he should give that as his reason in our Mishna!? **A:** Rather, **R' Yochanan** said, it is an established ruling of **R' Yehuda** that the korbbon of the tzibbur is not divided.

MISHNA

- A piggul intent regarding a Korbbon Todah makes the breads piggul, but a piggul intent regarding the breads does not make the todah piggul. How so? If he shechted the todah with intent to eat it the next day, both the korbbon and the breads become piggul. However, if he shechted with intent to eat the breads the next day, the breads become piggul, but the todah does not.
- A piggul intent regarding the lambs of the Shte Halechem makes the breads piggul, but a piggul intent regarding the breads does not make the lambs piggul. How so? If he shechted the lambs with intent to eat it the next day, both the lambs and the breads become piggul. However, if he shechted with intent to eat the breads the next day, the breads become piggul, but the lambs does not.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why does piggul intent regarding the todah make the breads piggul? It can't be based on the statement of **R' Kahana** which said that the pasuk refers to the breads as a "todah" as well, because if that is the reason, then a piggul intent regarding the breads should make the todah piggul as well!? **A:** That is not problematic, because the breads are referred to as a todah, but the todah is not referred to as breads.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says that piggul intent regarding the lambs of the Shte Halechem makes the breads piggul, but a piggul intent regarding the breads does not make the lambs piggul. Now, we don't find anywhere that the breads are referred to as "lambs" and yet they cause the breads to become piggul!? **A:** Rather, the reason for this "one-way"

relationship is that the breads are an accessory for the todah and for the lambs, which is why they become piggul along with the korbon, but the reverse is not true.

- The reason the Mishna had to give both cases is, that if we would have only said the case of the todah we would have said that it is only in that case that the breads don't make the korbon piggul, because they never become connected with a tenufah. However, the Shte Halechem and the lambs have a tenufah done together, and we would think that because of this even an intent on the breads would make the lambs piggul. That is why the Mishna gives this case as well.
- **Q: R' Elazar** asked **Rav**, what is the halacha if one shechted a todah with intent to eat a combined kezayis of the korbon and the bread the next day? Clearly the korbon will not become piggul, but will the breads become piggul? **A: Rav** said, in this case as well the breads become piggul and the korbon does not.
 - **Q:** We should say a kal v'chomer – if the thing that is making the piggul (the korbon) does not itself become piggul, then the thing that cannot make piggul (the breads cannot make the korbon piggul) should surely not become piggul!?! **A:** We don't make such a kal v'chomer, as can be seen in a Braisa which says: it once happened that a person planted seeds of another species in the vineyard of his friend and the **Rabanan** said that the seeds are assur but the grapes remain mutar. Now, why don't we say a kal v'chomer that if the grapes which are making the seeds assur don't become assur, then the seeds which are not making anything assur should surely not become assur! We see that we don't make such a kal v'chomer.
 - **Q:** This is not a valid answer! Those seeds are only assur D'Rabanan and therefore the **Rabanan** made only the seeds assur to penalize the one who did the improper act. However, in our case we should say the kal v'chomer!?
 - There is another version that taught that **R' Elazar** asked this question and had the conversation that followed, all in regard to where the lambs were shechted with intent to eat a combined kezayis of the korbon and the bread the next day.
 - The Gemara says, the first version would agree that the same question applies regarding the lambs and the breads. The second version would say that it is only a question regarding the lambs and the breads, because they are combined as one unit for the tenufah.
 - **R' Abba Zuti** said, the question **R' Elazar** asked was, what if he shechted the lamb with intent to eat "its friend" the next day? Do we say that "its friend" refers to the other lamb and it therefore will not become piggul, or do we say it refers to the breads and it therefore will make the bread piggul? **Rav** answered, a Mishna clearly says that if he shechted the lamb with intent to eat "its friend" the next day, neither of them become piggul. **R' Elazar** said, the case of the Mishna may be that he intended for "its friend the other lamb", and not just "its friend".

MISHNA

- A piggul intent regarding a korbon will make the accompanying nesachim into piggul once they have been made kadosh in a keili. This is the view of **R' Meir**. However, a piggul intent regarding the nesachim will not make the korbon into piggul. How so? If he shechted the korbon with intent to eat the korbon the next day, the korbon and the nesachim become piggul. If he had the intent to offer the nesachim the next day, the nesachim would become piggul, but the korbon would not.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, with regard to nesachim brought along with an animal korbon one can be chayuv kares for piggul, because the blood of the korbon is matir the nesachim to be offered on the Mizbe'ach. This is the view of **R' Meir**. The **Chachomim** said to him, a person may even bring the nesachim for a korbon 10 days after the korbon is brought!?! **R' Meir** said, I only stated my opinion regarding nesachim that are brought at the same time as the korbon. They said to him, the nesachim may be used for another korbon (which again shows that it is not so connected to the korbon that it should be able to be made piggul by it)!? **Rava** explained, that **R' Meir** holds that once the korbon is shechted the nesachim may not be used for another korbon.

- A Braisa says, one can be chayuv kares for the oil of a metzora that became piggul, because the zrika of the blood of the asham is matir the oil to be applied to the metzora. This is the view of **R' Meir**. The **Chachomim** said to him, a person may even bring the oil 10 days after the korbon is brought!? **R' Meir** said, I only stated my opinion regarding oil that is brought at the same time as the korbon. They said to him, the oil may be used for another korbon (which again shows that it is not so connected to the korbon that it should be able to be made piggul by it)!? **Rava** explained, that **R' Meir** holds that once the korbon is shechted the oil may not be used for another korbon.