



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

Zevachim Daf Lamed Aleph

- If the Kohen intended to consume half a kezayis beyond its time and another half a kezayis beyond its allowable place and then yet another half a kezayis beyond its time, **Rava** says the piggul "has awoken" and the korbon is piggul. **R' Hamnuna** says it is considered to be a mixing of intents and it is passul, but there is no kares.
 - **Rava** brings a proof from a Mishna regarding tumah, which says that where there was a full kibeitza of food that was a rishon l'tumah, and another kibeitza that was a sheini l'tumah, and they were split in half, and half of the one mixed with half of the other, the mixture has the status of a sheini. However, if the two half kibeitza's of the rishon were recombined, it would again have the status of a rishon. We see this concept that the two things that are separate can be recombined, and the same would hold true for piggul.
 - **R' Hamnuna** does not agree with this proof. He says the cases are different, because in the case of tumah there was a full required amount at the onset – a kibeitza. In our case of piggul there was not a full kezayis at the onset, and that is why we will not say that it later combines.
 - **R' Hamnuna** brings a proof from a Mishna regarding tumah, which says that a half kibeitza of a rishon can combine with a half kibeitza of a sheini to be considered a sheini and make things tamei as a sheini would. This suggests that even if another half kibeitza of a rishon was added to the mixture it would not change the status to a rishon.
 - **Rava** would say that the Mishna be talking about a case of where another half kibeitza is not added, but if it were, it may be that it would be treated as a rishon.
 - **R' Dimi** said, if the Kohen intended to consume half a kezayis beyond its place and another half a kezayis beyond its time and then yet another half a kezayis beyond its time, **Bar Kappara** taught that it would be piggul, because the half kezayis of beyond its place is not effective to separate the two half kezayis of beyond its time that were done one after the other.
 - **Ravin** said, if the Kohen intended to consume half a kezayis beyond its time and another half a kezayis beyond its place and then yet another half a kezayis beyond its place, **Bar Kappara** taught that it would be piggul, because the half kezayis of beyond its place is not effective to separate the two half kezayis of beyond its time that were done one after the other.
 - **R' Ashi** said, if the Kohen intended to consume half a kezayis beyond its time and another full kezayis – half for beyond its place and half for beyond its time, **Bar Kappara** taught that it would be piggul, because the half kezayis of beyond its place is not effective to separate the two half kezayis of beyond its time that were done.
- **R' Yannai** said, an intent to give the korbon to dogs to eat beyond its time is considered a "consumption", as can be seen in a pasuk, and would therefore make the korbon piggul.
 - **Q: R' Ami** asked, if so, there is a pasuk that refers to burning as consumption, and therefore if he has an intent to burn something on a fire other than the Mizbe'ach beyond its time it should also become piggul!? However, this can't be, because a Mishna says that an intent to eat beyond its time cannot be combined with an intent to burn on the Mizbe'ach beyond its time. This shows that consumption by fire is not the same as consumption by people, even though the pasuk refers to burning as "eating". In this same way, the pasuk that refers to the dog's eating as "eating" should not be the same as human eating!? **A:** If he would intend to burn the korbon beyond its time and he used verbiage of "consumption", it actually would combine. The Mishna is talking about

where he uses verbiage of “haktara”, and that is why it can’t combine with human consumption.

- **Q: R’ Assi** asked, what if he intends that a kezayis will be eaten beyond its time or place by two people? Do we follow the intent – which consisted of the required amount, or do we follow the ones who will consume – which makes it less than the required amount per person and it therefore could not make piggul? **A: Abaye** said, the Mishna says that if he intends to eat half a kezayis and burn half a kezayis, both beyond the time or place, it is valid, because the eating and burning don’t combine. This suggests that the problem is that it is eating and burning, but if it was eating and eating – where there are two people eating the one kezayis – it seems that it would combine and it would make it into piggul.
- **Q: Rava** asked, what if he intends to eat a kezayis beyond its time or place, but he intends to do so in longer than “kidei achilas pras”? Do we compare this eating to consumption of the Mizbe’ach, which doesn’t have this time requirement or do we compare it to a regular human eating, which does? **A: Abaye** said, the Mishna says that if he intends to eat half a kezayis and burn half a kezayis, both beyond the time or place, it is valid, because the eating and burning don’t combine. This suggests that if it was eating and eating in a way that is similar to eating and burning it would be piggul. Presumably this means that if the eating and eating was done in more time than kidei achilas pras, like burning, and we see that it does become piggul.
 - The Gemara says this is no proof, because the intent to burn may have been to burn it in a very large fire, where it would not take longer than kidei achilas pras to burn it.

LECHOL KACHATZI ZAYIS ULIHAKTIR KACHATZI ZAYIS KASHER

- **Q:** The Mishna suggests that the reason the two intents don’t combine is that one intent was for eating and the other was for burning. However, in the similar case of eating a half kezayis of something that is meant to be eaten and eating another half kezayis of something that is not meant to be eaten it would combine. Now, the earlier part of the Mishna specifically said that the intent only makes it passul when he intends something that is meant to be eaten or burns something that is meant to be burned!? **A: R’ Yirmiya** said, this later part of the Mishna is the view of **R’ Eliezer**, who argues on the **Rabanan** in a Mishna and says that when an intent is made to eat something that is meant to be burned, or to burn something that is meant to be eaten, beyond its place or time, it does make the korban passul. **A2: Abaye** said that this later part of the Mishna can even be following the view of the **Rabanan**, and the inference from the Mishna is not that an intent to eat something that is not meant to be eaten combines, but rather that if he intends to eat half of a kezayis and then another half of a kezayis of something that is meant to be eaten, they combine.
 - **Q:** According to **Abaye**, what is the chiddush? The earlier parts of the Mishna teach that intents to eat things that are meant to be eaten combine, and we can also learn from there that if only things that are meant to be eaten combine, certainly intents for eating and burning do not combine, so what is this part of the Mishna coming to teach? **A:** The Mishna is teaching that intents for eating and burning do not combine. We would not be able to learn this from the fact that intents for eating something that is meant to be eaten and to eat something that is not meant to be eaten do not combine, because we would say that those don’t combine because it involves an intent to do something that is not the normal way of doing it. However, an intent to eat something that is meant to be eaten and an intent to burn something that is meant to be burned should combine, because they are both an intent to do something that is meant to be done. Therefore, the Mishna needs to teach that these intents also do not combine.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL HAZEVAHIM!!!