Mishnah Menahot, chapter 2

(1) If he lifted the three fingers-full [intending] to eat the remainder or to burn the three fingers-full the next day; in this case, Rabbi Yose agrees that the offering is pigul and involves the penalty of karet. [However, if while lifting the three fingers-full he intended] to burn the frankincense the next day, Rabbi Yose says: it is invalid, but does not involve karet [the reason being, that improper intent during the performance of one matir (i.e., that which renders the sacrifice or offering valid and allows the remainder to be eaten), regarding a second matir does not cause pigul]; but the Sages say; [Since both the three fingers-full and the frankincense are in one bowl, both are considered one matir and thus] it is pigul and does involve karet. They [the Sages] said to him; How does this differ from an animal offering [where if one slaughtered with the intent of offering the sacrificial fats the next day it becomes pigul and involves karet]? He said to them; Regarding the animal offering; The blood, the flesh and the sacrificial portions are all of one variety, but the frankincense is not of the same variety as the meal-offering [and are thus two matirim and therefore, if while lifting the three fingers-full he had intended to burn the frankincense the next day, it does not become pigul; the halachah follows the Sages].

(2) If he slaughtered the two lambs [of Shavuot, intending] to eat one of the...
[accompanying two] loaves on the next day, [the lambs are matir the loaves], or if he burned the two cups [of the frankincense, intending] to eat one of the [two] rows of the showbread (see Leviticus 24:5-9) the next day, [the cups of the frankincense, when burned upon the altar are the matir for the showbread].

Rabbi Yose says: That loaf or that row regarding which he had the intention is pigul and involves the penalty of karet, while the other is invalid, but does not involve the penalty of karet [since they are considered two separate units]. But the Sages say: [Both loaves, and in the latter case, both rows of the showbread are considered one unit and if one becomes pigul] both are pigul and involve karet. If [before the sprinkling of the blood on the altar] one of the [two] loaves [offered with the two lambs of Shavuot], or [before the cups of the frankincense were burned] one of the [two] rows [of the showbread] became defiled, Rabbi Yehudah says: Both must be taken out to the place of burning, for the offering of the Congregation may not be divided [and if one part becomes disqualified,]
all of it becomes disqualified]. But the Sages say: The defiled [loaf, or row, is treated] as defiled, but the pure [loaf or row] may be eaten.

(3) The thanksgiving-offering can render the [accompanying forty] loaves (see Leviticus 7:12 and Rashi there) pigul, but the loaves cannot render the thanksgiving-offering pigul. How so? If he slaughtered the thanksgiving-offering intending to eat a part of it the next day, both it and the loaves are pigul; however, if he intended to eat of the loaves the next day, the loaves are pigul, but the thanksgiving-offering is not pigul [since the loaves accompanying the offering are considered a minor component of the offering, this cannot affect the major component]. The [peace-offering] lambs [of Shavuot] can render the [two loaves of the first-offering] bread (see Leviticus 23:17) pigul, but the [two loaves of] bread cannot render the lambs pigul. How so? If he slaughtered the lambs, intending to eat a part of it the next day, both they and the bread are pigul; however, if he intended to eat of the bread the next day, [since the two loaves of bread are considered a minor component, even though they do require lifting together with the lambs (ibid. verse 20)] the [two loaves of] bread are pigul but the lambs are not.

(4) An animal-offering can render the libations [either of flour and oil or of wine] pigul [and one who consumes them liable karet, but only] after they have been rendered.
sanctified in a [holy] vessel; these are the words of Rabbi Meir [who maintains (see Zevahim 4:3) that drink-offerings brought at the same time as the animal-offering are considered as being permitted for the altar by the sprinkling of the blood and hence, have a matir. The Sages, however, maintain that since libations can be offered the next day they are, therefore, independent of the sacrifice and thus have no matir and therefore, cannot become pigul]. However [even according to Rabbi Meir] the libations [being the minor component] cannot render the animal offering pigul. How so? If he slaughtered an animal offering intending to eat of it the next day, both it and the libations are pigul; however, if he intended to offer the libations the next day, the libations are pigul, but the animal offering is not.

(5) If he had an intention of pigul [i.e., he had intended to eat the remainder of the flour left over after the three fingers-full has been lifted after its permitted time] during the [burning of the] three fingers-full, but [did] not [have such an intention] during the [burning of the] frankincense, or [he had an intention of pigul] during the [burning of the] frankincense, but not during the [burning of the] flour, Rabbi Meir says: [Half a matir is sufficient and] it is pigul and [if eaten, one] is liable karet. However [even according to Rabbi Meir] the libations [being the minor component] cannot render the animal offering pigul. How so? If he slaughtered an animal offering intending to eat of it the next day, both it and the libations are pigul; however, if he intended to offer the libations the next day, the libations are pigul, but the animal offering is not.
liable karet, since [no frankincense is offered] the three fingers-full is the entire matir. If he slaughtered one of the [two peace-offering] lambs [of Shavuot and thus half the matir], intending to eat the two loaves [of bread] the next day, or if he burned one of the [two] cups of frankincense [i.e., half the matir], intending to eat the two rows [of the showbread] the next day, Rabbi Meir says: [Half a matir is sufficient and therefore] it is pigul and [if eaten one] is liable karet; but the Sages say; One is not liable karet unless he had the intention of pigul during the service of the whole of the matir [the halachah follows the Sages]. If he slaughtered one of the [peace-offering] lambs [of Shavuot] intending to eat a part of it the next day, that [lamb] is pigul but the other [lamb] is valid; if he intended to eat of the other [lamb] the next day, both are valid [since improper intent during the performance of one matir regarding a second matir, does not cause pigul. The exception being, the case in the first Mishnah where both matirim are in the same bowl (see above)].