



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

Menachos Daf Yud Zayin

- The “sharp ones of Pumbedisa” said, the burning of the kometz can effect piggul in the burning of the levonah (if during the burning of the kometz the Kohen intended to burn the levonah the next day, it makes it piggul). Even according to the **Rabanan** who say that piggul can't be created with only half a matir, that is only when while burning the kometz he intended to eat the shirayim the next day. However, when the intent was regarding the levonah it is considered to have been done during the entire matir and it does become piggul.
 - **Rava** said, we can prove this from the earlier Mishna which said that 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. Now, presumably just as an intent during the kemitza, putting into a keili, or bringing to the Mizbe'ach creates piggul whether the intent was to eat the shirayim beyond its time or to burn the levonah beyond its time, the same is true for such intent during the burning of the kometz!
 - The Gemara says, this is not a valid proof. It may be that during the other 3 avodos, an intent regarding eating or burning would create piggul, but during the burning, it may be that only an intent regarding the eating of the shirayim would create piggul.
 - **R' Menashyeh bar Gada** said to **Abaye** in the name of **R' Chisda**, the burning of the kometz cannot effect piggul in the burning of the levonah. Even according to **R' Meir** who says that piggul can be created with only half a matir, that is only when while burning the kometz he intended to eat the shirayim the next day, because the kometz is its matir. However, when the intent was regarding the levonah, since the kometz is not its matir, it will not create piggul. **Abaye** asked him, did he say this in the name of **Rav**? **R' Menashyeh** said, that he in fact did. We find elsewhere as well, that **R' Chisda** had said this in the name of **Rav**.
 - **R' Yaakov bar Idi in the name of Abaye** said, we can bring a proof to this from the Mishna, which said that if he shechted one of the Shavuos lambs with intent to eat the other lamb the next day, they remain valid. Presumably, this is because one lamb is not the matir of the other, and that is why it cannot make it piggul!
 - The Gemara says, this is not a valid proof. It may be that in that case it cannot create piggul, because the two lambs are never put into one keili. However, the kometz and the levonah are put into the same keili, which establishes them as one, and that may be why the intent during the kometz can effect the levonah.
 - **R' Hamnuna** said that **R' Chanina** taught him, if a Kohen burns the kometz with intent to burn the levonah the next day and to eat the shirayim the next day, it becomes piggul.
 - **Q:** What is he teaching? If he is teaching that the burning of the kometz can effect piggul in the burning of the levonah, then let him just give that case! If he is teaching that there is piggul even with only half a matir, then let him only give the case of intent to eat the shirayim the next day! If he meant to teach both things, then he should give both cases (as he did), but should say that he had this intent *or* that intent, why the need to say that he had both? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** said, in truth he holds that the burning of the kometz cannot effect

piggul in the burning of the levonah, and he holds that intent during half a matir cannot make piggul. The reason why it becomes piggul in this case is because he ultimately had intent regarding all parts of the mincha.

- A Braisa was taught in front of **R' Yitzchak bar Abba** that said, if one burned the kometz with intent to eat the shirayim the next day, all agree that it becomes piggul. He asked, we have learned that it is a machlokes between **R' Meir and the Rabanan!**? Rather, say that the Braisa says that all agree that the korbon is passul (they argue whether it is full piggul).
 - **Q:** Why didn't he instead say that the Braisa says it is piggul and only follows the view of **R' Meir**? **A:** The Braisa was taught as saying that all agree. It is more likely that a mistake was made between "passul" and "piggul" than to say that there was a mistake made between "all agree" and "this is only the view of **R' Meir**".

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HAKOMETZ ES HAMINCHA!!!

PEREK HAKOMETZ RABBAH -- PEREK SHLISHI

MISHNA

- If a Kohen does the kemitza with intent to eat something that is not meant to be eaten or to burn something that is not meant to be burned, in either case beyond its allowable place or time, the korbon remains valid. **R' Eliezer** says the korbon is passul.
 - If the intent was to eat something that is meant to be eaten or to burn something that is meant to be burned beyond its place or time, but the intent was regarding less than a kezayis, the korbon is valid.
 - If the intent was to eat half a kezayis of the shirayim and to burn half a kezayis of the kometz or levona beyond its place or time, the korbon is valid, because eating and burning don't combine.

GEMARA

- **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the reason of **R' Eliezer** is based on the pasuk of "v'ihm hei'achol yei'acheil", which suggests there are "two eatings" – one of people and one of the Mizbe'ach – and teaches that intent to put onto the Mizbe'ach something meant to be eaten by people, or visa-versa, can create piggul. This drasha is based on the fact that the Torah refers to the burning on the Mizbe'ach as "eating". The **Rabanan** (who argue on **R' Eliezer**) say that the reason the Torah refers to the burning as eating is to either teach that if the intent to burn was formulated using verbiage of "eating" it can still create piggul, or to teach that just as eating must be at least the size of a kezayis, the same is true for burning on the Mizbe'ach. **R' Eliezer** says, to teach that, the pasuk's double verbiage should have used the same word twice. The fact that it changed words teaches a second drasha (the one he darshened above).
 - **R' Zeira** asked **R' Assi**, if **R' Eliezer's** opinion is based on a pasuk, he should even say that there is a chiyuv kares for this!? Yet, you have said in the name of **R' Yochanan** that **R' Eliezer** agrees that there is no kares!? **R' Assi** said, there is a machlokes Tanna'im whether **R' Eliezer** holds this is D'Oraisa, in which case there would be kares, or if he holds it is only D'Rabanan, in which case there would not be kares. In fact, we can prove this from a Braisa. The Braisa says, if someone shechts a korbon with intent to drink the blood the next day, or to burn the meat on the Mizbe'ach the next day, or to eat the eimurim the next day, the korbon is valid. **R' Eliezer** says it is passul. If he intends to leave the blood over until the next day, **R' Yehuda** says the korbon is passul. **R' Elazar** said, in this case also **R' Eliezer** will say that it is passul and the **Chachomim** will say that it is valid. Now, whose view is **R' Yehuda** following? He can't be following the **Rabanan**, because if they say that when the person says it will be consumed the next day it is valid, then surely if he just says that it will be left over to the next day it will certainly be valid! Rather, he must be following the view of **R' Eliezer**. If so, when **R' Elazar** says that in this case also **R' Eliezer** will say that it is passul and the **Chachomim** will say that it is valid, **R' Elazar** is saying the exact same thing as **R' Yehuda!**? Rather, we must say that they argue as to whether or not there is kares – **R' Yehuda** is saying that there will be

kares in the first case and **R' Elazar** is saying that there will not be kares in either case. We see that there is a machlokes whether **R' Eliezer** holds there is kares when the intention was to eat something that was meant to be burned, or visa-versa.

- The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. It may be that all agree that there would not be kares in that first case, and there is actually a 3-way machlokes in the Braisa: the **T"K** holds that **R' Eliezer and the Rabanan** only argue in the first case, but in the case of intent to leave over the blood all would agree that the korbon is valid, **R' Yehuda** says that in the case of intent to leave over the blood all would agree that the korbon is passul as a gezeira for a case when all the blood is left over to the next day, which a Braisa teaches would actually be passul D'Oraisa, and **R' Elazar** holds that even in the case of intent to leave over the blood the **Rabanan and R' Eliezer** argue.