



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

Menachos Daf Tes Zayin

MISHNA

- If a Kohen had piggul intention during the burning of the kemitza of the mincha, but not during the burning of the levonah, or visa-versa, **R' Meir** says it is piggul and carries kares, and the **Chachomim** say there is no piggul until the intent is had during the entire matir (the permitter of the rest of the korbon). The **Chachomim** agree with **R' Meir** regarding a chatas mincha and a sotah's mincha that it becomes piggul with a chiyuv kares if there is piggul intent during the burning of the kometz, because the kometz is the full matir of that korbon (there is no levonah).
 - If during the shechita of one of the two lambs of the Shte Halechem korbon he intended to eat the two challos the next day, or if he burned one of the spoons of levonah from the Shulchan with intent to eat from the 2 arrangements of the Lechem Hapanim the next day, **R' Meir** says it is piggul and there is kares, and the **Chachomim** say there is no piggul until the intent is had during the entire matir.
 - If he shechted one of the lambs with intent to eat from the lamb the next day, that lamb becomes piggul but the other lamb remains valid. If during the shechita he intended to eat from the other lamb the next day, they are both valid.

GEMARA

- **Rav** said, the machlokes is where the kometz was put on the Mizbe'ach without any intent and the levonah was then put on with piggul intent, or visa-versa. However, if the kometz was first put on with piggul intent and the levonah was then put on without piggul intent, or visa-versa, all would agree that it is piggul. This is because all who act do so based on their initial intent. **Shmuel** said, that even in this second case there is still a machlokes. **R' Yochanan** said this as well.
 - **Rabbah** repeated this teaching of **Rav**. **R' Acha bar R' Huna** asked, a Braisa says, with regard to a mincha, if piggul intent is had during the offering of the kemitza and the levonah is offered in silence, or if the kemitza is offered in silence and the levonah is offered with piggul intent, **R' Meir** says it is piggul with kares and the **Chachomim** say there is only piggul when the intent is on the full matir. We see contrary to **Rav**, that even in the case where the kometz was done with piggul intent and the levonah was done without it, there is still a machlokes!? **Rabbah** answered, the Braisa means that the kometz was put on with piggul intent when the levonah *had already been put on* without piggul intent.
 - **Q:** First of all, that would be the same case as the first case of the Braisa!? Second of all, the Braisa says "*and then* the levonah was put on..."? **A:** **R' Chanina** said, that the case is discussing two different Kohanim – one who burned the kometz and one who burned the levonah (therefore the intent of one does not carry for the action of the second).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, that with regard to blood applications of the inside Mizbe'ach, if a piggul intent was had during the first application or even during the second or third application, **R' Meir** says it is piggul with a chiyuv kares and the **Chachomim** say that there is no kares until the intent was on the full matir. Now, the Braisa says that they argue even when they intended during the first applications and not during the later ones. This refutes **Rav**!? **A:** **Rava** said the Braisa is discussing where the first application was done with a piggul intent, the second was done in silence, and the third was again done with piggul intent. **R' Meir** holds its piggul, because the second one is considered to have been done with piggul intent as well. The **Rabanan** don't make that assumption and therefore say it is not piggul. The chiddush is, that we would think that the fact that

he had the intent during the third one again shows that the second was not done based on his initial intent.

- **Q: R' Ashi** asked, the Braisa doesn't make any mention of the Kohen being silent!? **A:** Rather, **R' Ashi** said, the Braisa is discussing where the Kohen had piggul intent during the 1st and 2nd application and was quiet during the 3rd application. We would think that **R' Meir** would agree that we don't say that the 3rd was done based on his initial intent, because if so, why did he need to have the intent during the 2nd as well? The Braisa teaches that **R' Meir** says this is piggul as well.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says "whether during the 1st or the second...", not that it was during both!? This is a KASHYEH.
- **Q:** The Braisa was explained to mean that **R' Meir** says it is piggul and a chiyuv kares whether he had the piggul intent during the first, second, or third applications. Now, we have learned that there is no kares for piggul unless all the blood avodos are done. However, if there is a piggul intent regarding one of the earlier applications, it is as if the later applications are not made at all, so there should not be kares!? **A: Rabbah** said, the case could be where the blood of a different animal was used for each of the applications (the blood spilled in between), and therefore it is considered to be a complete avodah. **Rava** said, it can be that there were not multiple animals. The reason there is kares is that the applications after the intent are considered valid to the extent that they create piggul.
- **Q:** What is the halacha if the Kohen had piggul intent during the holacha of the kometz but not of the levonah – is it piggul? **A: R' Yochanan** said holacha is like kemitza (just like the kemitza is considered to be on the entire matir even though it is only done to the flour, the same is true regarding the holacha), and **Reish Lakish** said holacha is like the burning (and therefore piggul intent on the kometz is considered to be on only half the matir and it will not become piggul).
 - **Q:** According to **Reish Lakish** we can understand the reason being that the levonah also needs a holacha. What is the reasoning of **R' Yochanan**? **A: Rava** said, **R' Yochanan** holds that any avodah that is not matir the korbbon to be eaten is considered to be a significant avodah in that it can make piggul through it alone. Holacha is such an avodah and that is why it alone can create piggul.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked **Rava**, the shechita of the Shavuot lambs do not permit the korbbon to be eaten (it is the zrika that does so) and yet **R' Meir and the Rabanan** argue in a Mishna, and the **Rabanan** say that if one of the lambs is shechted with piggul intent it does not become piggul, because it is not an entire matir!? **A: Rava** said, the two challos only become kadosh through the shechting of the two lambs. An avodah that makes something kadosh is treated like an avodah that is matir something to be eaten. Therefore, since the intent was not present during the entire matir, it does not become piggul.
 - **Q: R' Simi bar Ashi** asked, there is a contradiction between a Mishna and a Braisa regarding Korbbon Pesach which is answered by saying that the Mishna follows the **Rabanan** and the Braisa follows **R' Meir**. According to this answer it comes out that the **Rabanan** hold that even during shechita of the Pesach a piggul intent will only make it piggul if it was had during the entire matir. This is so even though it is not the shechita that makes it mutar to eat. This refutes **Rava**!? **A: Rava** said, it is the shechita that makes the blood kadosh. An avodah that makes something kadosh is treated like an avodah that is matir something to be eaten. Therefore, since the intent was not present during the entire matir, it does not become piggul.
 - **Q:** A Braisa clearly says that piggul intent during the kemitza, putting into the keili, and holacha of the kometz alone (without the levonah) creates piggul. This refutes **Reish Lakish**!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to the holacha of the kometz to the keili, whereas **Reish Lakish** was talking about the holacha of the kometz to the Mizbe'ach.
 - **Q:** The Braisa lists the avodos it refers to as "kemitza, putting it into a keili, holacha". According to this answer the Braisa should list holacha *before* putting it into a keili!? **A:** Change the Braisa to say that.

- **Q:** The Braisa then says “when it comes to the burning, the piggul intent must be regarding the entire matir”. Now, according to what you are saying, the Braisa should say, “When it comes to the holacha” and onward intent is needed for the entire matir!? **A:** Since the holacha is done for the purpose of burning, the Braisa refers to it as “burning”.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says, “If he put the kometz on the Mizbe’ach without piggul intent and then put the levonah there with piggul intent...”. According to you, the Braisa should discuss the holacha!? This remains a KASHYEH.
- With regard to a case where the Kohen burned a piece of the kometz equal to a sesame seed with intent to eat a sesame seed sized piece of the shiryaim the next day, and he then had this intent during each sesame seed sized piece that he burned of the kometz and the levonah, until he ultimately burned the entire kometz and levonah, there is a 3-way machlokes between **R’ Chisda, R’ Hamnuna, and R’ Sheishes**: one says the korbon is piggul, one says it is passul (but does not have kares) and one says the korbon is valid.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that the one who says it is piggul follows **R’ Meir**, who says that piggul can be created through half a matir, and the one who says it is passul follows the **Rabanan** who argue on **R’ Meir**, and the one who says it is valid follows **Rebbi**, who said earlier that separate intent on separate parts of the korbon don’t combine to make it passul? **A:** It may be that **R’ Meir** won’t hold this way regarding intents on less than the required minimum amount. It may also be that the **Rabanan** only argue there because there was no intent on the full matir, but here, there is ultimately an intent on the entire matir. It may also be that **Rebbi** only holds that way where the completion of the intent was on a different avodah, but here, the entire intent was on the same avodah, so he may agree that it is passul. Rather, the view that says it is piggul can follow all the Tanna’im (**R’ Meir, the Rabanan, and Rebbi**), because he holds that burning and eating of pieces this size is a normal and proper thing and therefore it is regular piggul, the view that says it is passul can follow all the Tanna’im, because he holds that this is a normal manner of eating but not a normal manner of burning and it is therefore treated like a mincha that was not burned on the Mizbe’ach and is passul, and the view that says it is valid can follow all the Tanna’im, because he holds that this is a normal manner of burning but not a normal manner of eating, and therefore it is not piggul and is in fact a valid korbon.