



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

Zevachim Daf Lamed

- A Mishna says, if a person says “this animal should be a temurah for an Olah, a temurah for a Shelamim”, **R' Meir** says the animal becomes a temurah for an Olah. **R' Yose** says, if the person intended to make this full statement from the onset (it wasn't because he changed his mind mid-sentence) it is as if he said it simultaneously, and the animal becomes a temurah for an Olah and for a Shelamim. However, if the second statement was due to a change in mind, it is only a temurah for an olah.
 - **Q:** What would **R' Meir** hold if a person says, “this animal should be a temurah for an olah and a shelamim” (without saying the word “temurah” a second time)? What about where the person said “let half be a temurah for an olah and half a temurah for a shelamim”? **A: Abaye** said, that in this last case **R' Meir** would agree that both designations take effect, but **Rava** said, the machlokes would even be in this last case.
 - **Q: Rava** asked **Abaye**, according to you our Mishna is difficult. The Mishna speaks of where two intentions were had during the shechita, which is like the case of saying that half should be for an olah and half for a shelamim, and yet there is a machlokes in our Mishna!? **A: Abaye** said, the act of shechita is not viewed as happening at the very end of the act of shechita, rather it is viewed as taking place from the beginning until the end. The Mishna is therefore speaking of where he intended for beyond its time during the cutting of one “siman” (the trachea or esophagus) and had an intent for beyond its allowable place during the cutting of the other siman.
 - **Q:** The act of kemitza which is done with two intentions is like the case of saying that half should be for an olah and half for a shelamim, and yet there is a machlokes in a Mishna!? **A: Abaye** said, in that Mishna also, the case is where he had one intent during the kemitza of the flour and another intent during the kemitza of the levonah.
 - **Q:** There is the case of the chatas mincha, which has no levonah, and yet there is a machlokes there when both intentions were had during the kemitza!? **A: Abaye** said, there actually is no machlokes in that case. **R' Ashi** said, even if they do argue, we can say that they are arguing where he had one intention during one step of the holacha and the other intention during another step.
 - **R' Simi bar Ashi** held like **Abaye**, and **R' Huna bar Nosson** held like **Rava**.
 - **R' Dimi** said that the view of **R' Meir** is the same as the view of **R' Yehuda** in our Mishna, which is that when two things are said we give more significance to the first thing. We see this in our Mishna where **R' Yehuda** says a general rule, that if the intent for beyond its time was had first, the korbon is piggul and carries kares. **Abaye** asked, **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said that **R' Meir** and **R' Yose** actually both agree that we do not give more significance to the first thing that is said. If so, **R' Meir** does not hold like **R' Yehuda**!? **R' Dimi** answered, you can't say that **R' Meir** and **R' Yose** don't argue, because we clearly see that they do! **Abaye** said, they disagree only regarding the narrow matter in which they argue, but not more globally beyond that. In fact, we find that **R' Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan** said, **R' Meir** and **R' Yose** agree that where the person said “let the olah designation take effect and then let the shelamim designation take effect”, only the first designation takes effect. If he said “let this designation take effect only if that designation takes effect” all agree that they would both take effect. The machlokes is where he said “this is a temuras olah, a

temuras shelamim". In that case **R' Meir** says, since he added the second "temuras" it shows that he was retracting from his first statement, and a retraction is ineffective. **R' Yose** says, the reason he didn't just say "temuras olah and shelamim" is because he felt that would suggest that half should be a temuras olah and half should be a temuras shelamim. He used the word temuras a second time to show that the entire animal should be a temurah for an olah and a temurah for a shelamim. We see that **R' Meir** doesn't hold that we give more significance to the first statement that is said! **R' Dimi** answered, **Rabbah bar bar Chana** says that they don't argue, but I hold that they do argue regarding this issue.

- **Q: Ulla** (or **R' Oshaya**) asked, when **R' Yehuda and the Rabanan** argue in the Mishna, is the case where the person had an intent for "a kezayis beyond its time, a kezayis beyond its allowable place", or was the intent for "a kezayis beyond its time **and** a kezayis beyond its allowable place"? If the case is without the "and", then maybe it is only there where **R' Yehuda** says we follow the first phrase, but if he said "and" he would agree that there is a mixing of intents and the korbon would therefore not be piggul. If the case is where he said "and", and still **R' Yehuda** says we follow the first phrase, then certainly in a case where he did not say "and" he would follow the first phrase. **A:** We can answer from a question that **Levi** asked **Rebbi**. He asked, what is the halacha according to **R' Yehuda** if the Kohen intended to eat "a kezayis tomorrow outside of its allowable place"? **Rebbi** said, this is a great question. The answer is, that this would make a mixture of intentions and it would therefore not become piggul. **R' Shimon the son of Rebbi** said, this seems to be suggested by our Mishna as well. The Mishna gave the examples of "a kezayis tomorrow, a kezayis outside its place" and visa-versa, and "a half kezayis tomorrow and a half kezayis outside its place" and visa-versa, and said that in those cases **R' Yehuda** argued. This would suggest that in other cases he would agree that it is a mixture of intents and would not become piggul. **Rebbi** told him, the Mishna only suggests that to you, because I taught you the Mishna as including the cases with the "and" and without the "and". However, to **Levi** I only taught one version, and when he heard the talmidim learning both versions it raised his question. It must be that **Levi** was taught the version of "a kezayis beyond its time, a kezayis beyond its allowable place" and by asking regarding the case of "a kezayis tomorrow outside of its allowable place" and getting the answer from **Rebbi** that it is a mixing of intentions, without **Rebbi** getting annoyed at the question, it showed that it is only in that case that it is a mixture of intents, but the case of "and" would be two separate statements according to **R' Yehuda**. Based on this we see that the proper version of the Mishna is even with the "and".