



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Zevachim, Daf 1 – Daf 2

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

#### -----Daf 1---6-----

- **Q:** Does a korbon which is offered not lishma (which is valid but does not fulfil the obligation of the owner), provide a kappara for the aveira for which it was brought? **A: R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said, it would make sense that it does not bring a kappara, because if it did, why would another korbon have to be brought?
  - **Q:** If it does not provide a kappara, then what is the point of bringing it at all? **A: R' Ashi** explained, that **R' Shisha** meant to say, if it does not bring a kappara we can understand why both korbanos are brought – the one offered not lishma is brought because it was a korbon that was made kadosh lishma, and the person later brings another korbon to get his kappara. However, if we say that the first one brings a kappara, why is the second one brought?
- **Q:** Does an olah bring a kappara for an assei that was violated after the korbon was designated as an olah or not? Do we say that it is no different than a chatas, and therefore it will only bring a kappara for a violation committed prior to its designation, or do we say that an olah is different than a chatas in that a single olah can serve as a kappara for the violations of many different assei's, so maybe it can also bring a kappara for a violation that took place after its designation? **A:** We can answer from a Braisa. The Braisa says, the pasuk regarding olah says "v'samach...v'nirtza", which suggests that the smicha is what brings the kapparah. Now, we know that the kapparah comes from the offering of the blood, not the smicha! Rather, the pasuk is teaching that if one is not careful with the smicha and does not do it, the pasuk considers it as if he did not get his kapparah, although he did get it. Presumably, what this means is that although he will have a kappara for the assei's that he was oiver before he designated this olah he will not have a kapparah for violating the assei of smicha, because that did not happen until after the designation.
  - **Rava** said, this does not answer the question. Smicha can be done until the shechita, which means that the assei of smicha is not violated until after the shechita. We know that the olah cannot provide a kapparah for an assei that is violated after its shechita. Our question is whether it can provide a kappara for an assei that was violated after its designation, but before its shechita, and that is not something that is addressed by the Braisa.
    - **R' Huna bar Yehuda** said to **Rava**, we can understand the Braisa as meaning that the person gets a kappara, even for the assei of smicha, but that there is no acceptance by Hashem and it is not pleasing for Him, but the person does not bring another korbon. In fact, we find this in a Mishna. The Mishna says that the leftover oil used by the Kohen in a metzora tahara process should be put onto the metzora's head. **R' Akiva** says, if it is put on his head there is a kappara and if not, there is not. **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** said, this is only a residual mitzvah, and therefore, whether he put it on his head or not, there is a kappara, but we consider it as if there is no kappara. Now, presumably, the Mishna means that although there is a kappara, there is no acceptance by Hashem and it is not pleasing for Him, but the person does not bring another korbon. We see this concept here as well. **Rava** said, that is not what the Mishna means. The Mishna means that if the oil is not put on the metzora's head, there is a kappara that comes about from putting the oil on the thumbs of the metzora, but there is no kappara for putting the oil on his head (since it was not put on his head) and he therefore must still do that.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can answer the question (whether an olah can bring a kappara for an assei that was violated after the olah was already designated) from a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R' Shimon** says, why are the male goats brought as korbanos on Shavuot? They are brought to bring a kappara for tumas Mikdash ukidashav. Once the first one had its blood offered on the Mizbe'ach, why is the second one needed? It is for tumah that happened between this one and that one (between the offering of the first goat and the second goat). Now, if the tumah happened after the bringing of the first goat, it means that

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

this assei was violated after the designation of the goats and we see that the korbon still brings a kappara for it! **A:** The Braisa can be talking about where the goats were not designated at the same time, and the second goat is therefore mechaper for tumah that happened between the *designation* of the first goat and the *designation* of the second goat.

- **Q:** That would mean that the pasuk that requires two korbanos to be brought is only referring to a case where they were not designated at the same time? **A:** **R' Pappa** said, we are discussing korbanos of the tzibbur and, as **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, a korbon tzibbur does not get its designation until immediately before its shechita. This is based on a stipulation of Beis Din.
  - **Q:** **R' Yosef the son of R' Shmuel** asked **R' Pappa**, we find that **R' Shimon** does not agree with this concept!? Also, we find that **R' Yirmiya** asked **R' Zeira**, does the second korbon bring a kappara for an assei that was violated between the zrika of the first korbon and the zrika of the second korbon? We see that they are asking about an assei that was violated after the shechita, which would suggest that they were certain that an assei violated after designation would certainly get a kappara!? **A:** The Gemara says that this second question can be answered by saying that maybe **R' Yirmiya** was asking about both cases – can it bring a kappara for an assei violated after the animal's designation, and if you say that it can, what about for an assei that was violated after the shechita.

### -----Daf 7-----

- We have learned, with regard to a todah that was shechted with intent for someone else's todah (it was intended for the proper owner, but with intent for the reason of the todah of someone else), **Rabbah** says it is valid, because it is a todah that was intended to be offered as a todah, and **R' Chisda** says it is passul, because we need the todah to be offered for the person's own type of todah (and shechting it with the intent for the reason of the other person's todah is just like offering it for the sake of another korbon).
  - **Rabbah** brings support from a Braisa. The Braisa says, the pasuk says "ubisar zevach todas shilamav". **Abba Chanin in the name of R' Eliezer** said, this teaches that a todah shechted for the sake of a shelamim is valid, but a shelamim shechted for the sake of a todah is passul. The reason for the difference is that a todah is called a shelamim, but a shelamim is not called a todah. Now, the Braisa says that a shelamim for the sake of a todah is passul, which suggests that a todah for the sake of a different todah (that of another person) would be valid!
    - The Gemara says this is no proof. The Braisa may mean that a todah of a person offered for the sake of a different todah that that same person must bring for another reason, is valid.
      - **Q:** **Rabbah** asked, according to this you will say that if the todah is offered with intent for the reason behind the todah of someone else, it would be passul. If so, instead of giving the case of a shelamim offered as a todah and saying that it is passul, it should give the case of a todah offered for the sake of someone else's todah, which you are saying is passul, and we would know that certainly a shelamim offered as a todah is passul!? **A:** The Braisa needed to give this case for where the shelamim of a person is offered for the sake of that person's todah. We would think that it should be valid. The Braisa therefore teaches that it is not.
- **Rava** said, a chatas that was shechted for the sake of another type of chatas is valid, but if it is shechted for the sake of an olah it is passul. This is based on the pasuk of "v'shachat osah l'chatas".
- **Rava** said, a chatas that was shechted for the sake of someone else who was chayuv to bring a chatas is passul, but if he has in mind for the sake of someone who is chayuv to bring an olah it is valid. This is based on the pasuk of "v'chiper alav" – which we darshen to mean that the chatas must be brought for the sake of kappara for the owner, and not for someone else who is like the owner in that he also needs a chatas for a kapparah.
- **Rava** said, if a chatas was shechted for the sake of someone who is not obligated to bring any korbon it is passul, because there is no Yid who has not violated an assei, and **Rava** has said that a chatas can provide a kappara for

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

violation of an assei based on a kal v'chomer – if it can provide a kappara for an aveira that carries a kares penalty, certainly it can provide a kappara for the violation of an assei.

- **Q: Rava** said above, that a chatas that was shechted for the sake of someone else who was chayuv to bring a chatas is passul, but if he has in mind for the sake of someone who is chayuv to bring an olah it is valid. Now, one who has violated an assei is chayuv an olah. If so, why does **Rava** say here that it would be passul because every Yid has violated an assei!? **A:** The chatas provides some level of kappara for a violation of an assei only until the person decides to bring the olah. Once he does, the chatas no longer provides any kappara and that person would no longer be considered as one who is chayuy to bring a chatas.
- **Rava** said, an olah that was shechted not lishma is still assur to have the zrika done not lishma. This can be based on logic (as explained earlier, that just because one wrong was done does not mean that we should allow another wrong to be done) or can be based on the pasuk of “motza sifasecha” (as explained earlier).
- **Rava** said, with regard to an olah that is brought after the death of the owner, if it is brought for the sake of another korbon it will not fulfil the owner’s obligation, but if it brought for the sake of a different owner, it still does fulfil the obligation of the true owner, because we view it as if there is no owner, since he has died. **R’ Pinchas the son of R’ Ami** said that there is an owner after death (the heir becomes the new owner).
  - **R’ Ashi** asked **R’ Pinchas the son of R’ Ami**, do you mean that the heir becomes the owner to the extent that if the olah was offered for the sake of another person the heir would have to bring a new korbon, or do you mean that he is considered to be the owner in the sense that if the heir had violated an assei this olah will serve to bring a kappara? **R’ Pinchas** said, I meant it in the first sense (and he therefore argues on **Rava**).
- **Rava** said, an olah is a gift offered to Hashem after he has been forgiven for the violation of the assei. It can’t be that the olah itself brings the kappara, because if it is offered before the person did teshuva, it would be labeled as a “zevach resha’im”, which the pasuk says is a “to’eiva”. If he did teshuva first, a Braisa says that when a person does teshuva for violation of an assei he is *immediately* forgiven. Therefore, it must be that the olah is brought as a gift. A Braisa suggests this as well.

CHUTZ MIN HAPESACH V’HACHATAS...

- **Q:** How do we know that a Korbon Pesach is passul when it is shechted not lishma? **A:** The pasuk says “v’asisa Pesach”, which teaches that all the Avodos should be done for the sake of the Pesach.
  - **Q:** That teaches that it must be offered lishma for the korbon. How do we know it must also be offered lishma for the owner? **A:** The pasuk says “zevach Pesach hu”, which teaches that the shechita should be for the sake of a Pesach. Now, since we already know this from the other pasuk, we will say that this teaches that it must also be lishma for the owner.
  - **Q:** How do we know that these requirements must be followed even b’dieved, and if they are not it will be passul? **A:** The pasuk of “v’zavachta Pesach LaHashem Elokecha” is an extra pasuk, which comes to teach that if it is offered not lishma, it will be passul.
    - **Q: R’ Safra** asked, this pasuk is needed for the drasha of **R’ Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha**, who says that the pasuk teaches that an animal designated as a Pesach which was not ultimately brought as a Pesach gets the status of a Shelamim!? **A:** Rather, **R’ Safra** said, the pasuk of “v’zavachta Pesach” teaches the ruling of **R’ Nachman**. The pasuk of “v’asisa Pesach” teaches the requirement (l’chatchila) that it must be offered lishma as a Pesach. The pasuk of “zevach Pesach” teaches the requirement (l’chatchila) that it must be offered lishma for the owner. The word “hu” teaches that in both cases this requirement is even b’dieved, and if not done will be passul.
    - **Q:** The pasuk of “zevach Pesach” refers only to shechita. How do we know that the other Avodos must also be done lishma for the owner? **A:** Once the Torah showed regarding lishma for the korbon that it applies to shechting and all the other Avodos, we can learn that since there is a requirement for lishma for the owner by shechita, it also applies for the other Avodos as well. **A2: R’ Ashi** said, we could not say this. Rather, he said, the pasuk compares all korbanos to each other in the pasuk of “zos hatorah l’olah laminecha...”. A Braisa says, the next pasuk that says

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

“b’yom tzavoso es Bnei Yisrael l’hakriv korbineyhem” refers to bechor, maaser, and Pesach and serves to compare them to shelamim as well. This teaches that just as a shelamim must be offered lishma for the korbon and the owner, so too all other korbanos must be offered lishma. And just as a shelamim has no difference regarding the shechita and the other Avodos – they all have the requirement of lishma, but are all valid even if offered not lishma, the same is true for a Pesach – shechita and all the other Avodos have the lishma requirement and the korbon is passul if any of the Avodos are done not lishma.

- **Q:** According to **R’ Ashi**, what is the word “hu” needed for? **A:** It is used in a Braisa to teach that when the word “hu” is written by an asham, it does not teach that if offered not lishma it will be passul, because the word “hu” is written regarding an Avodah that is not an essential Avodah (the offering of the parts of the animal on the Mizbe’ach).

### -----Daf 7---8-----

- **Q:** How do we know that a chatas must be offered lishma? **A:** The pasuk says “v’shachat osah l’chatas”, which teaches that the shechita must be done for the sake of the chatas.
  - **Q:** That teaches regarding the shechita. How do we know that the kabbalah must be done lishma? **A:** The pasuk says “v’lakach hakohen midam hachatas”, which teaches that the kabbalah must be done lishma.
  - **Q:** How do we know that the zrika must be done lishma? **A:** The pasuk says “v’chiper alav hakohen meichataso”, which teaches that the zrika must be lishma.
- **Q:** We now have a source that a chatas must be offered lishma for a chatas. How do we know that it must also be offered lishma for the owner? **A:** The pasuk regarding zrika says “alav”, which teaches that it must be done “for him” and not for someone else.
- **Q:** This all teaches that l’chatchila this must be done. How do we know that it is essential and that the korbon becomes passul if it is not done? **A:** It is as **R’ Huna the son of R’ Yehoshua** said in regard to a nazir’s chatas, that the “vuv” of “chataso” teaches that it must be done lishma. Here too, we will say that the “vuv” of “chataso” teaches that it must be done lishma, and the fact that we already know this means that this pasuk is coming to teach that it is essential.
- **Q:** We now have learned a source that there is a requirement of lishma for the korbon, but we don’t have a source that it is essential, and we have a source that zrika must be done lishma for the owner and that requirement is even essential. How do we know that the requirement that it be lishma for the korbon is essential, and how do we know that the Avodos besides zrika must be done lishma for the owner – both l’chatchila and that it is essential? **A:** **R’ Yonah** said we learn this from the chatas of a nazir, where the pasuk says “v’asa es chataso v’es olaso”, which teaches the halacha of lishma, and since we already know the lishma requirement from a regular chatas, this pasuk is teaching that it is essential.
  - **Q:** This takes care of lishma for the korbon. What about lishma for the owner? **A:** **R’ Huna the son of R’ Yehoshua** said, the pasuk could have said “chatas” and instead says “chataso”. This teaches that it must be done lishma for the person.
    - **Q:** **Ravina** asked, if we darshen in this way, then how do we darshen the word “olaso” in the pasuk? [The Gemara asks, why doesn’t **Ravina** ask how we will darshen the words “minchaso” and “nisko”? The Gemara says, those words teach that the mincha and nesachem may sometimes be brought at night or the next day.] Furthermore, we cannot learn the case of a regular chatas from the case of a nazir’s chatas, because the nazir brings other korbanos along with the chatas, and a chatas nazir cannot be learned from a regular chatas because a regular chatas is brought only for a sin that carries kares! **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, we learn it from the chatas of a metzora, where the pasuk teaches lishma when it says “v’asa hakohen es hachatas”. This pasuk will teach that the lishma requirement is essential.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** This takes care of lishma for the korbon. What about lishma for the owner? **A:** The pasuk says “v’chiper ahl hamitaher” which teaches that the chatas must be offered for the sake of this person, not someone else.
- **Q:** We cannot learn the case of a regular chatas from the case of a metzora’s chatas, because the metzora brings other korbanos along with the chatas, and a chatas metzora cannot be learned from a regular chatas, because a regular chatas is brought only for a sin that carries kares!? If you will say that we can’t learn one chatas from another, but maybe we can learn one chatas from the other two, which one would you say should not be written and learned from the other two? A regular chatas can’t be learned from nazir and metzora, because they bring other korbanos along with their chatas. We can’t learn nazir from a regular chatas and a metzora’s chatas, because a nazir is different in that he can have his nezirus nullified!? We can’t learn out metzora from a regular chatas and a nazir’s chatas, because they cannot be brought from birds, whereas a metzora’s chatas can be!? **A:** Rather, the pasuk of “zos hatorah...” creates a hekesh where we compare a chatas to a shelamim, and teaches that just as shelamim has a requirement that it must be offered lishma for the korbon and for the owner, the same is true for chatas. Therefore, all the other pesukim that we mentioned above teach that the requirement is essential when it comes to a chatas, and the korbon will be passul without it.
  - **Q:** We now understand how we know that a regular chatas must be offered lishma and that it is an essential requirement. How do we know that the chatas brought for the sin of avoda zara, and the oleh v’yoreid brought for shmiyas kol, bituy sifasayim, and tumas Mikdash also become passul if they are not offered lishma? **A:** We learn the chatas for avoda zara from a regular chatas, since they are both brought for sins that carry kares, and the others are learned from a regular chatas, a nazir’s chatas, and a metzora’s chatas.
- A Braisa says, when a Pesach is brought in its proper time (the afternoon of Erev Pesach), if it is offered for the sake of a Pesach it is valid and if not it is passul. If it is offered at any other time, then if it is offered for the sake of a Pesach it is passul and if it is offered not for the sake of a Pesach, it is valid.
  - **Q:** How do we know this halacha, that at any other time if it is offered for the sake of something other than a Pesach it is valid? **A:** The father of **Shmuel** said, the pasuk says “v’ihm min hatzon korbono l’zevach shelamim LaHashem”. This teaches that something which is brought from “tzon” (i.e. the Pesach) is treated as a shelamim.
    - **Q:** Maybe this means that if it is offered for the sake of a shelamim it is valid, but if it is offered for the sake of anything else it is passul? **A:** **R’ Eila in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, the word “l’zevach” comes to include any type of korbon, not just a shelamim.
    - **Q:** Maybe this means that whatever type of korbon is was shechted for is the type of korbon it becomes, and it doesn’t just become a shelamim? **A:** That would be true if the pasuk had said “l’ishlamim l’zevach”. Since the pasuk says “l’zevach shelamim” it teaches that whatever korbon it is shechted for, it becomes a shelamim.
    - **Q:** Maybe we should say that “l’zevach” is a klal and “shelamim” is a prat, in which case it would teach to limit this to a shelamim, and it is only valid when it is shechted for the sake of a shelamim!? **A:** The word “LaHashem” is another klal, so in fact we have a klal uprat uklal. Although the first klal is different than the second klal (the word “LaHashem” would even include birds and menachos), **R’ Yishmael** has taught that we still darshen such a case as a klal uprat uklal. This would teach that just as the prat is an example of where the Pesach was shechted not for its sake and yet it is valid, so too in any case where the Pesach is shechted not for its sake (even if the intent was for a korbon other than a shelamim) it will be valid.
      - **Q:** Maybe we should say that just as the prat (a shelamim) is something that can be brought as a neder or a nedava, so too the only things included by the klal are things that are like that, and therefore if it is shechted for the sake of an olah or shelamim it

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

would be valid, but if it was shechted for the sake of a chatas or ashm it would not be valid? **A:** Rather, “I’zevach” is not a klal. It is an extra word. This extra word teaches that the Pesach is valid when shechted for the sake of any korbon other than itself.

- **Q:** Maybe say that it should take on the status of whatever korbon it was intended for? **A: R’ Avin** said, we say that a korbon that was supposed to be eaten (the Pesach) can become another korbon that is eaten (a shelamim) and will not become a korbon that cannot be eaten (an olah).
  - **Q:** A chatas and ashm are eaten, so maybe it can take on the status of these when that was the intent? **A:** They are only eaten by Kohanim. We say that the Pesach can become something that can be eaten by all people (a shelamim) just like the pesach itself, and can’t become something that is only eaten by certain people. **A2: R’ Yose the son of R’ Avin** said, we can give something that is kodshei kalim (the Pesach) the status of something that is also kodshei kalim (the shelamim) and won’t give it the status of something that is kodshei kodashim (the chatas or ashm).

### -----Daf 9-----

- **Q:** The Gemara has been discussing the halacha that if a Pesach is shechted at any other time other than the afternoon of Erev Peach and was shechted not for its own sake, it has the status of a shelamim. **R’ Yitzchak the son of R’ Savrin** asked, why don’t we say that if it was shechted for the sake of a korbon maaser it should be treated as a korbon maaser, meaning that it would not need nesachim and that the person would get malkus if he sold it, based on the pasuk of “lo yiga’el”? **A:** The pasuk regarding maaser says “ha’asiri yihiyeh kodesh”, which teaches that only the tenth animal is maaser, and nothing else.
  - **Q:** Why don’t we say that if it was shechted for the sake of a korbon bechor it should be treated as a korbon bechor, meaning that it would not need nesachim and that it would have to be given to the Kohanim? **A:** We learn bechor from maaser with a gezeira shava, and therefore say that only a firstborn animal is treated as a bechor, and nothing else.
  - **Q:** Why don’t we say that if it was shechted for the sake of a temurah it should be treated as a temurah, meaning that he would get malkus for making a temurah? **A: Mar Zutra the son of R’ Nachman** said, the pasuk regarding temurah says “v’haya hu usimuraso”, which teaches that temurah is only created through the regular process of placing the kedusha of a korbon onto another animal, not any other way.
  - **Q:** Why don’t we say that if it was shechted for the sake of a todah it should be treated as a todah, meaning that he would have to bring breads along with the korbon? **A:** It can’t be that a Pesach itself doesn’t need breads to be brought along with it, but the “leftover Pesach” (a Pesach brought at some other time) does.
    - **Q:** If so, how can the Pesach become a shelamim? We should say that it can’t be that the Pesach itself does not require nesachim, but the “leftover Pesach” needs nesachim!? **A:** What the Gemara meant to answer is, that it can’t be that a “leftover todah” (where an animal was designated as a todah but then not used for the todah, in which case it is brought as a korbon without the breads) doesn’t bring breads along with it, but that a leftover Pesach which was offered as a todah should have breads be brought along with it.
- **Q:** The Gemara above stated that the pasuk of “v’ihm min hatzon” refers to a leftover Pesach, because a Pesach is brought from tzon. **R’ Yeimar the son of R’ Hillel** asked, maybe the pasuk refers to a leftover ashm, because an ashm is also brought from tzon!? **A: Rava** said, the words “v’ihm min hatzon” suggest something that can be brought from anything in the category of “tzon” (which is sheep and goats), which is true for a Pesach, but is not true for an ashm, which can only be brought from sheep, not goats.
  - **Q: R’ Avin bar Chiya** (or **Bar Kahana**) asked, the word “min” typically is darshened as an exclusionary term, and yet here you are darshening it as an inclusionary term (to include all types of tzon)!? **A: R’**

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

**Mani** said, here too the word “min” is exclusionary, because it excludes an animal in its second year and a female tzon from being brought as a Pesach.

- **Q: R’ Chana of Bagdad** asked, the pasuk later in that parsha says “ihm kesev...ihm eiz”. If it is referring to a Pesach there would be no reason to specify the sheep and goat, because we know a Pesach can be brought from these kinds!? **A:** A Braisa says, the words of “ihm kesev...ihm eiz” teach something else, and are therefore not extra. The word “kesev” teaches that if a sheep is brought, its tail is offered on the Mizbe’ach; “ihm kesev” teaches that a Pesach that has passed its first year or any shelamim that is brought because of a Pesach needs smicha, nesachim, and tenufa, like any other shelamim; “ihm eiz” teaches that if a goat is brought, its tail is not offered on the Mizbe’ach.
  - **Q:** The halacha that a Pesach that is not needed as a Pesach is brought as a shelamim is learned from a drasha of the father of **Shmuel**, who said, the pasuk says “v’ihm min hatzon korbano l’zevach shelamim”, which teaches that something that is brought from tzon (i.e. a Pesach) is to be brought as a shelamim. Why is a second pasuk needed to teach the same thing!? In fact, we learn this concept for a third pasuk as well. **R’ Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** learns this from the pasuk of “v’zavachta Pesach ...tzon ubakar”, which teaches that a Pesach is sometimes brought as something which can be brought from tzon and bakar – which is a shelamim. Why are all three pesukim needed to teach this halacha!? **A:** One is needed to teach a case where the time for shechting a Pesach has passed and the animal’s first year has passed (in which case it is no longer fit to be used as a Pesach), a second pasuk is needed to teach a case where the time for shechting has passed but its first year has not passed (even though it is still fit to be offered on Pesach Sheini), and the third pasuk is needed for a case where the time for shechting has not passed and its first year has not passed, but it was shechted as a shelamim (even though it is still fit to be used as a regular Korbon Pesach). In all these cases the korbon is treated as a shelamim.
- **Rav in the name of Mavog** said, if a chatas was shechted with intent that it is for the “chatas of Nachson” (the chatas brought by the nasi at the time the Mishkan was finished), it is valid. This is based on the pasuk of “zos toras hachatas”, which teaches that there is one set of laws for all types of korbon chatas.
  - **Q: R’ Mesharshiya** asked **Rava**, a Braisa says that **R’ Shimon** says that a korbon mincha that had the kemitza done for the sake of a different type of korbon mincha is valid and fulfils the obligation of the owner. The reason is, that each type of mincha is noticeably different than the other (different methods of making the mixture) and therefore intent for something else won’t make it passul, since we can clearly see what was actually offered. This is different than animal korbanos where the shechita, kabbalah, holacha, and zrika are the same by all. Now, it seems that if not for the physical differences among the menachos, intent for a different mincha would make it passul. However, according to what **Rav** said, it should not be passul, because the pasuk regarding korbon mincha says “zos toras hamincha”, which should teach that there is one set of laws for all types of korbon mincha!? **A:** Rather, we must say that **Rav in the name of Mavog** said, if a chatas was shechted with intent that it is for the “chatas of Nachson” it is valid, because there is no kapparah for people who passed away, and therefore an intent for Nachshon is meaningless.
    - **Q:** If that is what he was teaching, why did he choose to say “Nachshon” rather than some other person? **A:** He was teaching that it is valid only because Nachshon is no longer alive. However, had he been alive and a chatas was brought with intent for that type of chatas (a chatas that is not brought for a true sin) it would be passul. Practically, he is teaching that a chatas that is brought with intent that it is a chatas nazir or a chatas metzora, is passul.
      - **Q:** There korbanos are actually like olos, and therefore a chatas brought with intent for them should be valid (we have learned that a chatas brought for the sake of someone who is chayuv an olah is valid)!? **A:** Rather, we must say that **Rav in the name of Mavog** said, if a chatas was shechted with intent that it is for someone who is chayuv to bring a chatas like the “chatas of Nachson” it is valid, because such a korbon is actually like an olah.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Others** say, that **Rav in the name of Mavog** said, if a chatas was shechted with intent that it is for the “chatas of Nachshon” it is passul, because this korbon is actually an olah, and a chatas that is shechted for the sake of an olah is passul.
  - **Q:** Why didn’t he just use chatas nazir or chatas metzora as his example? **A:** He chose Nachshon, because that was the first chatas brought that was not for a sin.
- **Rava** said, if a chatas brought for the sin of cheilev was shechted with intent for a chatas brought for the sin of eating blood or the sin of avoda zara, it is valid. If it was shechted for the sake of a chatas nazir or a chatas metzora, it is passul, because these are actually olos.
  - **Q: Rava** asked, what if a chatas brought for the sin of cheilev was shechted for the sake of a chatas brought for the sin of tumas Mikdash? Do we say that since tumas Mikdash carries the kares penalty it is like a chatas brought for cheilev, and therefore it will be valid, or do we say that since the chatas of tumah Mikdash is an oleh v’yoreid it is not valid?
    - **R’ Acha the son of Rava** had a version where **Rava** said that a chatas for cheilev that was shechted for the sake of a chatas for blood or avoda zara is passul, because the pasuk says “v’shachat osah l’chatas”, which means that it must be offered for the sake of *that particular* chatas. **R’ Ashi** asked him, according to your version, what was the question that **Rava** then asked? **R’ Acha** said, I learned as follows – **Rava** said, if a chatas for cheilev is shechted for the sake of someone who is chayuv a chatas for blood or for avoda zara, it is passul. If it is shechted for the sake of a person who is chayuv a chatas nazir or a chatas metzora, it is valid, because they are actually olos. **Rava** then asked, what if a chatas brought for cheilev was shechted for the sake of someone who was chayuv a chatas for tumas Mikdash – do we say that since that sin also carries kares it is like any other chatas and therefore the korbon would be passul, or do we say that since it is an oleh v’yoreid it is considered to be a different type of korbon and is therefore valid? **TEIKU**.

### -----Daf ’10-----

- If a chatas was shechted lishma with intent that he would do the zrika not lishma, **R’ Yochanan** says the korbon is passul and **Reish Lakish** says it is valid. **R’ Yochanan** says it is passul, because he says that we learn from “piggul” (during one of the 4 blood Avodos the Kohen had in mind that the korbon would either be eaten or placed on the Mizbe’ach after its allowable time for doing so) that an intent had during one Avoda regarding another Avoda is effective (e.g. if during the shechita he has in mind to do the zrika after the allowable time, it is piggul and is passul). **Reish Lakish** says it is valid, because he says that an intent during one Avoda regarding another Avoda is not effective, and we don’t learn from piggul.
  - They are following their views stated elsewhere. We learned that if one shechts an animal with intent to do zrika or to offer the fats for the sake of avoda zara, **R’ Yochanan** says the animal is assur b’hana’ah, because an intent during one Avoda regarding another Avoda is effective, and we learn this halacha regarding avoda zara from the halacha regarding korbanos offered to Hashem. **Reish Lakish** says the animal is mutar b’hana’ah, because an intent during one Avoda regarding another Avoda is not effective, and we do not learn this halacha regarding avoda zara from the halacha regarding korbanos offered to Hashem.
    - It was necessary to have this machlokes in both places. If we only had the case of avoda zara we would say that only there **Reish Lakish** says that we can’t learn avoda zara from korbanos to Hashem, but when dealing with korbanos to Hashem we can learn one aspect from another (we can learn intent from one Avodah to another based on piggul). If we would only have the case of korbanos to Hashem, we would say that **R’ Yochanan** agrees that we cannot learn the case of avoda zara from the case of korbanos to Hashem. Therefore, both are needed.
  - When **R’ Dimi** came, he said that **R’ Yirmiya** asked in support of **R’ Yochanan** and **R’ Eila** asked in support of **Reish Lakish**.



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yirmiya** said, if regarding piggul, if a person would say "I am shechting this korbon beyond its proper time" the korbon remains valid, yet when during the shechita he intends to do the zrika beyond its proper time the korbon is passul, then regarding the halacha of lishma, where if a person would say "I am shechting this korbon not lishma" it is passul, then surely if he says during the shechita that he intends to do the zrika not lishma, it will be passul.
  - **Q: Rava bar Ahilai** asked, you can't make this kal v'chomer, because we can say that the case of piggul is more stringent in that it carries the kares penalty!? **A:** Rather, **Rava bar Ahilai** says, the kal v'chomer of **R' Yirmiya** was as follows. If a Kohen says "I am shechting this korbon outside of its proper place" it remains valid (the statement is meaningless if he ultimately shechts it in its proper place), and yet if he says during the shechita that he intends to do the zrika outside of its proper place it is passul (but there is no kares), then surely in a case of a regular korbon, where if he says he is shechting the korbon not lishma it is passul, then if he says he is shechting the korbon with intent to do the zrika not lishma it will certainly be passul!
    - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, this kal v'chomer is not valid. It may be that intent for beyond its place is treated like this because it is more stringent, since this halacha applies to all korbanos, whereas the psul of not lishma only applies to a korbon Pesach and chatas!? **A:** Rather, **R' Ashi** said, the kal v'chomer of **R' Yirmiya** was as follows. If a Kohen says "I am shechting this korbon for the sake of someone other than the owner" it is valid, yet if during the shechita he intends to do the zrika for the sake of someone other than the owner the korbon is passul, then in a case where if he says he is shechting the korbon not for its sake it will be passul, surely if he says during the shechita that he intends to do the zrika not for its sake it will be passul!
- **R' Eila** said, the Torah did not have to write the halacha of lishma for zrika, because it could be learned from a kal v'chomer from shechita and kabbalah. The reason that the Torah did write the halacha was to teach that intention during one Avodah regarding another Avodah is not effective.
  - **Q: R' Pappa** asked, maybe the fact that it is written teaches that intention during one Avodah regarding another Avodah *is* effective!? **A:** If that is what is meant to be taught, the Torah would not have to write it at all and it could be learned from the kal v'chomer.
  - **R' Yochanan** would say this is not a valid kal v'chomer, because he would say that shechita and kabbalah are more stringent in that they must be done in the north of the Azarah, and apply even by a korbon chatas that is offered on the inside Mizbe'ach (whereas zrika doesn't have these characteristics). **Reish Lakish** would say that lishma is learned from a shelamim, and the shechita and kabbalah of a shelamim do not have these requirements. Therefore, it is a valid kal v'chomer.
  - If a chatas was shechted lishma with intent that he would do the zrika not lishma, **R' Nachman** says the korbon is passul and **Rabbah** says it is valid. **Rabbah** then retracted his view and held like **R' Nachman** because of the kal v'chomer of **R' Ashi**.

R' ELIEZER OMER AHF HA'ASHAM

- A Braisa says, **R' Eliezer** said, a chatas is brought for a sin and an asham is brought for a sin. Just as a chatas becomes passul when it is offered not lishma, the same would be true for an asham. **R' Yehoshua** said, this comparison is not valid, because the blood of a chatas is put onto the Mizbe'ach above the line (that demarcated the halfway point of the height of the Mizbe'ach) whereas the blood of the asham is offered below the line. **R' Eliezer** said, a Korbon Pesach has its blood offered below the line and yet it is passul if shechted not lishma, so we see that the place of the offering of the blood is not determinative. **R' Yehoshua** said, Pesach is different, because it has a fixed time during the year when it can be offered! **R' Eliezer** said, a chatas can be offered anytime and yet it must be shechted lishma! **R' Yehoshua** said, I will repeat what I said earlier, that the asham cannot be compared to a chatas because its blood is offered above the line. **R' Eliezer** then made another

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

argument. He said, the pasuk regarding the shechita of the chatas says “hee” and the pasuk regarding the shechita of the Pesach says “hu”, which teach that if they are brought lishma they are valid, and if not they are passul. The pasuk regarding asham also says “hu” which therefore also teaches that if it is brought not lishma it is passul! **R’ Yehoshua** said, the “hu” written regarding an asham is written after stating the requirement to offer certain pieces of the korbon on the Mizbe’ach. The offering of those pieces are not essential and the korbon would be valid if they are not offered, so the “hu” written there cannot be said to teach that something is essential and would make the korbon passul! **R’ Eliezer** said, the pasuk says “kachatas ha’asham”, which teaches that just as a chatas becomes passul when it is offered not lishma, the same is true for an asham.

- **Q:** When **R’ Yehoshua** said “I will repeat what I said earlier, that the asham cannot be compared to a chatas because its blood is offered above the line”, why couldn’t we simply answer that we would then learn the asham from a tzad hashava from Pesach and chatas? **A:** We would refute that by saying that Pesach and chatas both have an aspect of kares, whereas an asham does not.
- **Q:** **R’ Yehoshua** said that chatas is different, because its blood is offered above the line. Why didn’t **R’ Yehoshua** say that chatas is different, because its blood is offered in the Kodosh Hakodashim, whereas the blood of an asham is not!? **A:** We are only referring to the chatas that is offered on the outside.
  - **Q:** Why didn’t he say that a chatas is more stringent, because when a chatas that is supposed to be offered outside is offered inside it becomes passul, whereas we don’t find that psul for an asham!? **A:** **R’ Eliezer** holds that an asham *would* become passul in this way as well.
  - **Q:** Why didn’t he say that a chatas is more stringent, because it provides a kapparah for one who was chayuv kares? **A:** **R’ Eliezer** would be able to learn asham from a chatas brought for the aveira of shmiyas kol, which does not carry kares.
  - **Q:** Why didn’t he say that a chatas is more stringent, because it requires the blood to be placed on each corner of the Mizbe’ach separately – 4 blood applications? **A:** **R’ Eliezer** holds like **R’ Yishmael**, who holds that all korbanos require 4 blood applications.
  - **Q:** Why didn’t he say that a chatas is more stringent, because it requires that its blood be placed on each of the 4 corners, whereas an asham is placed on the two opposite corners (thereby touching all 4 sides)? **A:** There are many other differences that he could have asked – chatas blood must be applied with the finger, must be applied on the horn, and must be applied down the edge of the Mizbe’ach. However, he chooses one thing to ask. That is why he doesn’t mention any others.
- **Q:** **R’ Yehoshua** said that chatas is different, because its blood is offered above the line. Why didn’t **R’ Eliezer** say that an asham should also be offered above the line like a chatas!? **A:** **Abaye** said, we could not say that, based on a kal v’chomer from olah – an olah is totally burned on the Mizbe’ach, and yet its blood is offered below the line, so certainly an asham’s blood is offered below the line.
  - **Q:** Maybe an olah is not offered above the line, because it does not bring a kapparah for a person? **A:** A bird chatas does bring a kapparah and is still offered below the line.
    - **Q:** A bird chatas does not require shechita, and maybe that is why it is offered below the line? **A:** An olah requires shechita and yet is offered below the line. We will go back and forth. The tzad hashava is that they are both kodshei kodashim and their blood is offered below the line. We will say that asham is in the same category and therefore also has its blood offered below the line.
    - **Q:** **Rava of Parzakya** asked **R’ Ashi**, maybe asham is different than these two in that it has a required minimum value? **A:** Rather, the reason **R’ Eliezer** holds that only a chatas has its blood offered above the line is because the pasuk says “hakohen hamichatei osah”, which teaches that only a chatas has its blood offered above the line, and no other korbon does.
      - **Q:** If he darshens in this way he should also darshen the “osah” of chatas to teach that only chatas becomes passul when it is not lishma, but other korbanos do not become passul!? **A:** The fact that Pesach also becomes passul in this way shows that the pasuk should not be darshened in this way.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** If so, it should not be darshened in this way for the placement of the blood, because a bird olah's blood is also applied above the line!? **A:** Still, with regard to a korbon that needs shechita it is only a chatas that has its blood applied above the line. **A2:** We can say that the Tanna follows **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon**, who says in a Braisa that the blood of a chatas is placed on the horn itself, whereas the blood of a bird olah is applied anywhere above the line (so they are not done in the same place).

### -----Daf X'---11-----

- A Mishna says, **R' Akiva** said, if the blood of any korbon that is supposed to be offered on the outside Mizbe'ach is instead offered on the inside Mizbe'ach, the korbon is passul. The **Chachomim** say, that is only true regarding a chatas. **R' Eliezer** says, it is also true for an asham.
  - **Q:** The view of **R' Eliezer** is based on the hekesh between chatas and asham. What is the basis for the view of the **Rabanan**? **A:** **Rava** said, the blood of an asham offered inside cannot make the asham passul, based on a kal v'chomer from olah – if olah, which is offered entirely on the Mizbe'ach, does not become passul when its blood is offered inside, then certainly an asham does not become passul when its blood is offered inside!
    - **Q:** Maybe an olah doesn't become passul in this way, because it does not provide a kapparah? **A:** The mincha chatas brings a kapparah, and yet it does not become passul in this way.
      - **Q:** Why didn't he disprove this using a bird chatas instead of a mincha chatas? **A:** It is because **R' Avin** actually questions whether a bird chatas becomes passul in this way.
      - **Q:** We can ask that a mincha chatas is different since it does not require shechita? **A:** The olah needs shechita and yet does not become passul in this way, which shows that this is not a determinative factor. We can go back and forth, with the tzad hashava being that the olah and mincha are both kodshei kodashim, and offering them on the inside Mizbe'ach does not make them passul. The same can be said for an asham as well.
        - **Q:** **Rava MiBarneish** asked **R' Ashi**, why don't we ask that asham cannot be grouped with them, because an asham has a minimum required value whereas the others don't? **A:** Rather, the reason for the view of the **Rabanan** is that the pasuk regarding chatas says "damah" (its blood), which teaches that this halacha is specific to chatas.
          - **R' Eliezer** would darshen "damah" to teach that it only becomes passul if its blood is offered inside, not if its meat is offered inside. The **Rabanan** darshen "dam" and "damah" and therefore make two drashos. **R' Eliezer** doesn't darshen two drashos from this word.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Shimon** says, the pasuk regarding a mincha that says "kachatas ka'asham" compares a mincha to a chatas and compares a mincha to an asham. According to the **Rabanan** (who say that an asham shechted not lishma does not become passul) this makes sense, because the pasuk is saying that a chatas mincha is like a chatas and becomes passul if the kemitza is done not lishma, and a minchas nedava is like an asham in that even if the kemitza is done not lishma it is valid. However, according to **R' Eliezer** (that even an asham is passul when shechted not lishma) for what purpose is a mincha compared to a chatas and to an asham? **A:** It is needed for another drasha of **R' Shimon** in a Mishna where he says that if a kometz is not placed into a kli shareis it is still valid, and **R' Yehuda the son of R' Chiya** says this is based on the pasuk of "kachatas ka'asham", which teaches that if the Kohen does it by hand, it should be done with the right hand like a chatas, and if it is done with a keili, it can be done with the left hand like an asham.
    - **Q:** If **R' Shimon** uses the pasuk for the other drasha how can he also use it for this drasha? **A:** He really uses this pasuk to teach the halacha regarding the kli shareis. The halacha of lishma he learns from

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

another pasuk. He says, we know a chatas must be lishma based on the word “hu”. The pasuk regarding a chatas mincha says “hee”, which teaches that if it is offered not lishma it is passul.

- **Q:** According to the **Rabanan** in our Mishna, for what purpose is chatas compared to asham? **A:** It is to teach that an asham needs smicha just like a chatas.

YOSEF BEN CHONI OMER HANISHCHATIN...

- **R' Yochanan** said, **Yosef ben Choni** and **R' Eliezer** say the same thing. **Rabbah** said, they argue regarding other korbanos that were shechted for the sake of a chatas.
  - We can see this from a Braisa which says, if an animal designated as a Pesach is now older than a year (which is pasul to be used for a Pesach, and therefore gets the din of a shelamim), but is nonetheless shechted as a Pesach on Erev Pesach, or an animal designated as any other type of korban which is shechted as a Pesach on Erev Pesach, **R' Eliezer** says it is a pasul korban and **R' Yehoshua** says it is a kosher korban (not as a Pesach, but as the other korban). **R' Yehoshua** said, if during the rest of the year, when a Pesach is not valid if it is shechted for the sake of a Pesach, if other korbanos are shechted for a Pesach they are valid, then on Erev Pesach, when a Pesach is valid if it is shechted for the sake of a Pesach, certainly other korbanos should be valid if they are shechted for the sake of a Pesach! **R' Eliezer** said, using that logic we can also learn a halacha which is obviously not true – if during the rest of the year a Pesach offered for its sake is passul and yet if it is offered for the sake of another korban it is valid, then on Erev Pesach, when it is valid if offered for its own sake it should certainly be valid if offered for the sake of another korban. Now, this halacha is not true! Rather, the reason why other korbanos are valid the rest of the year when they are offered for the sake of a Pesach is because a Pesach offered for the sake of another korban the rest of the year is valid. However, on Erev Pesach the Pesach will be passul if offered for the sake of another korban, so other korbanos that are offered for the sake of the Pesach at that time are also passul! [This is where **R' Yochanan** would see from **R' Eliezer**, that just as a chatas is passul when offered for the sake of another korban, any other korban would be passul if offered for the sake of a chatas.] **R' Yehoshua** said, this would make the shelamim more stringent than the Pesach!? **R' Eliezer** therefore darshened another drasha to prove his ruling. He said, the leftover Pesach is brought as a shelamim, but a leftover shelamim may not be brought as a Pesach. Yet, a Pesach on Erev Pesach is passul if offered for the sake of a shelamim, so certainly a shelamim offered as a Pesach on Erev Pesach would be passul! **R' Yehoshua** said, that a leftover chatas can at times be used to purchase and bring an olah, although a leftover olah can never be brought as a chatas. Now, even so, a chatas shechted for the sake of an olah is passul, so we should also then have to say that an olah offered as a chatas should be passul! [This is where **Rabbah** would deduce that **R' Eliezer** must hold that anything offered for a chatas would be valid.] **R' Eliezer** said, this is not a good comparison. A chatas is valid the entire year if it is offered for its own sake, and that may be why an olah is valid when it is offered for the sake of a chatas. However, a Pesach is passul when it is offered for its own sake at any time other than Erev Pesach afternoon, and that may be why another korban offered for its sake at that time would be passul.

SHIMON ACHI AZARYA OMER...

- **R' Ashi** in the name of **R' Yochanan** and **R' Acha** the son of **Rava** in the name of **R' Yannai** taught that the reason of **Shimon Achi Azarya** is based on the pasuk of “v'lo yichalilu es kadshei Bnei Yisrael eis asher yarimu LaHashem”. This is darshened to teach that if something is “raised” (“yarimu”) it does not become profaned, but if it is lowered, it does become profaned.
  - **Q:** This pasuk is used for another drasha regarding the eating of tevel!? **A:** The pasuk could have said “asher hurmu” and instead says “asher yarimu”, which allows for both drashos.
- **Q:** **R' Zeira** asked, does he mean that when offered for the sake of a korban of greater kedusha the korban is valid but does not fulfil the obligation of the owner, and in that way only argues on the **T”K** in one respect, or does he mean that such a korban even fulfils the owner’s obligation, and he would therefore argue with the **T”K** in two respects (validity of the korban and fulfilment of the obligation)? **A:** **Abaye** (or **R' Zrika**) said we can answer from the example that **Shimon** gives in the Mishna. He says that a bechor or maaser offered as a shelamim is valid, but the reverse is not. Now, a bechor and maaser has no fulfilment associated with them

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

(they bring no kapparah and are not an obligation of a neder). Clearly, with regard to these the Mishna means they are valid, but do not effect any fulfilment. Similarly, the other cases of the Mishna must mean that they are valid but do not effect fulfilment of any obligation.

- **Q:** Why can't we say that that part of the Mishna doesn't refer to fulfilment of an obligation but the other parts of the statement do!?
- **Q:** If this is not what he was teaching with this example, why did we need this example? He already said that kodshei kalim offered as kodshei kodashim are valid and the reverse is passul!  
**A:** We needed the case of bechor and maaser offered for a shelamim to teach that this rule of greater kedusha and lesser kedusha even applies within the category of kodshei kalim.
  - **Q:** Another Mishna already discusses that there is a hierarchy within kodshei kalim!? **A:** Our Mishna is the primary source for this rule. That other Mishna only mentions it incidentally.

### MISHNA

- If a Pesach is offered not for its own sake on the morning of Erev Pesach (as opposed to its proper time in the afternoon), **R' Yehoshua** says it is valid as if it was so offered on the 13<sup>th</sup> of Nisnon. **Ben Beseira** says it is passul as if it was so offered on the afternoon of Erev Pesach.
- **Shimon ben Azzai** said, I have a kabbalah from the 72 "zakein" (of the Sanhedrin) on the day that they appointed **R' Elazar ben Azarya** to be Nasi, that all korbanos that are eaten which are shechted not for their own sake, they are valid but don't fulfil the obligation of the owner, except for a Pesach and a chatas.
  - This ruling only adds an olah as also being passul (whereas the **T"K** of the previous Mishna holds the olah would be valid in this case). However, the **Chachomim** did not agree with him.

### GEMARA

- **R' Elazar in the name of R' Oshaya** said, **Ben Beseira** would say that a Pesach shechted lishma on the morning of Erev Pesach is valid, because the entire day is considered to be its proper time to be shechted. You may ask, that if so, what did **Ben Beseira** mean in the Mishna when he said it is "as if it is offered in the afternoon", since the morning is perfectly fine as well!? The reason is that since **R' Yehoshua** said "as if..." **Ben Beseira** used that verbiage as well.
  - **Q:** If so, why do they argue in a case of where it was offered not for its sake on the morning of Erev Pesach? Why don't they argue when it was offered for its sake on the morning of Erev Pesach!? **A:** If they would have argued in that case we would have thought that in the case of where it is offered not for its sake **R' Yehoshua** agrees with **Ben Beseira** since part of the day is fit for a Korban Pesach. The Mishna therefore teaches that **R' Yehoshua** says that a Pesach offered not for its sake on the morning of Erev Pesach is valid.
  - **Q:** The pasuk says, that the Pesach must be brought "bein ha'arbayim", which means the afternoon, so how could **Ben Beseira** say it is valid when shechted for its sake in the morning? **A: Ulla the son of R' Illai** said, he would explain the pasuk to mean "between two evenings" – which would include the morning of Erev Pesach as well.
    - **Q:** The pasuk regarding the second Korban Tamid also says "bein ha'arbayim". Does this also mean that it may be brought any time during the day!? **A:** Regarding tamid the pasuk says that the first one must be brought in the morning. Therefore, "bein ha'arbayim" must be understood literally, as referring to the afternoon.
      - **Q:** Maybe one must be brought in the morning and the other can be brought at any time during the day? **A:** The pasuk says "ha'echad taaseh baboker", which teaches that only one can be brought in the morning.
    - **Q:** The pasuk regarding the lighting of the menorah also says "bein ha'arbayim". Does this also mean that it may be done at any time during the day? **A:** The pasuk says "mei'erev ahd boker", which a Braisa says teaches it should be lit so that it can last from evening until morning. We see that it must be lit before evening, not in the morning.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The pasuk regarding the ketores also says “bein ha’arbayim”. Does this also mean that it may be done at any time during the day? **A:** The pasuk makes a hekesh from the lighting of the menorah to the offering of the ketores. This teaches that the ketores must be offered in the afternoon.
- **Q:** The pasuk regarding Pesach says “sham tizbach es hapesach ba’erev”, which clearly says it must be shechted in the afternoon, so how could **R’ Oshaya** say different!? **A:** That pasuk just teaches that if it is offered in the afternoon, it should be offered after the afternoon Tamid.
  - **Q:** Can it be that the morning is considered its proper time, and yet if it’s not offered until the afternoon it must wait until the Tamid is offered first!? **A:** Yes, as we find this concept from a ruling of **R’ Yochanan** that although Mussaf can be davened in the morning, if it was not, and the time for Mincha has arrived, one should first daven Mincha and only afterwards should he daven Mussaf.
- **Q:** According to **R’ Oshaya**, since “bein ha’arbayim” doesn’t on its own mean “in the afternoon”, why did the pesukim regarding the lighting of the menorah and the bringing of the ketores even use these words!? Also, a Braisa says clearly says that **Rebbi** said that **Ben Beseira** holds only part of the day of Erev Pesach is fit for offering the Korbon Pesach!? Clearly, **R’ Oshaya** must be incorrect!

### -----Daf כ"ב---12-----

- **R’ Oshaya** had said that **Ben Beseira** holds that a Korbon Pesach offered for its sake on the morning of Erev Pesach is valid. The Gemara refuted this view. The Gemara now says, **R’ Yochanan** says that **Ben Beseira** holds that a Korbon Pesach offered on the morning of Erev Pesach is *not* valid, whether offered for its sake or not for its sake, since part of that day is fit for the shechting of the Pesach.
  - **Q:** **R’ Avahu** asked, if this is true, then what would be the case of a valid Korbon Pesach? If the animal was designated on the morning of the 14<sup>th</sup> (Erev Pesach), since it is not fit to be brought as any korbon then it should become rejected at the moment that it is made hekdesch!? Even if it was designated a day earlier (when it could have been offered as a shelamim), when Erev Pesach morning arrives it is no longer fit to be offered at all, and should become rejected at that time!? **A:** **R’ Avahu** said, it must be that the animal was designated as a Pesach on Erev Pesach after chatzos. **A2:** **Abaye** said, it may even be designated on the morning of Erev Pesach, since it will be valid as a Pesach later that same day, it is not considered to be not fit in the sense that it will make it rejected. **A3:** **R’ Pappa** said, it may even be designated the night before, and since it will be valid as a Pesach later the next day, it is not considered to be not fit in the sense that it will make it rejected. We see this from **R’ Apturiki** in a Braisa taught by **R’ Yishmael**.
  - **R’ Zeira** said to **R’ Avahu**, this would seem to mean that **R’ Yochanan** holds that living things can become rejected from being offered on the Mizbe’ach!? **R’ Avahu** said, this is correct, as we find that **R’ Yochanan** says, if there is an animal belonging to two partners and one of the partners makes his half hekdesch, and he then buys the other half and makes it hekdesch as well, the entire animal is kadosh, but it may not be offered on the Mizbe’ach, and it is subject to the concept of temurah. From this statement we see three things: we see that a living animal can become permanently rejected from being able to be offered on the Mizbe’ach, we see that even if something is rejected at the time that it becomes hekdesch it is considered to be a full rejection, and we see that even something that only has monetary kedusha can become permanently rejected.
  - **Ulla in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, if someone ate “cheilev”, separated a korbon chatas to bring for the aveirah, and then became a “mumar”, and he then came back to Judaism, he cannot use that korbon, because once it was pushed away it remains pushed away. Similarly, **R’ Yirmiya in the name of R’ Avahu in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, if someone ate “cheilev”, separated a korbon chatas to bring for the aveirah, and then became a shoteh, and he then became sane again, he cannot use that korbon, because once it was pushed away it remains pushed away.
    - Both these cases are needed. If we would only have the first one we would say that in that case he is the one who made the korbon passul, but in the second case it happened on its own (so

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

maybe it does not remain passul). If we would only have the second case we would say it remains passul because he does not have the ability to regain his sanity, but in the first case he can decide to come back to Judaism (so maybe it does not remain passul).

- **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, what if someone ate cheilev, separated a chatas for the aveira, and then Beis Din paskened that cheilev is mutar, and they then retracted their psak. Do we say that the chatas is permanently rejected or not? **A:** A certain elder said, when **R' Yochanan** would discuss the cases of rejection he would begin with this very case. The reason is that in this case (as opposed to the two cases above) it is not the person who became rejected, rather it is the animal that became rejected.

AMAR SHIMON BEN AZZAI MIKUBLANI MIPI SHIVIM USHNAYIM ZAKEIN...

- **Q:** Why is the singular word of “zaken” used to refer to the entire Sanhedrin? **A:** He was saying that they were all of the same opinion regarding this.

LO HOSIF BEN AZZAI ELAH HA'OLAH

- **R' Huna** said, **Ben Azzai's** view is based on the pasuk of “olah hu”, which teaches that an olah must be offered lishma, and is passul if it is not.
  - **Q:** The pasuk of asham also says “hu”, so why don't we say it must also be offered lishma and if not it is passul? **A:** That “hu” is written in the pasuk which talks about after the burning of the required parts of the animal on the Mizbe'ach. Now, even that burning is not essential, so we can't say that the “hu” is teaching that something is essential.
  - **Q:** The “hu” of olah is also written after the burning of the pieces on the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** There are two “hu” written regarding olah.
    - **Q:** There are also two “hu” written regarding asham!? **A:** Rather, **Ben Azzai** learns his halacha based on a kal v'chomer – if a chatas, which is not entirely burned, must be offered lishma, then certainly an olah, which is entirely burned, must be offered lishma.
    - **Q:** We can ask that a chatas brings a kapparah, and maybe that is why it must be offered lishma!? **A:** Pesach does not bring a kapparah and yet it must be offered lishma.
    - **Q:** Pesach may only be offered at a fixed time, and maybe that is why it must be offered lishma!? **A:** Chatas can be offered at any time, and yet it must be offered lishma. We will go back and forth, with the result being that there is a tzad hashava that they are both kodashim, which if shechted not lishma become passul. We can put olah into this category as well.
    - **Q:** We can ask that Pesach and chatas are different in that they involve kares, which olah does not!? **A:** **Ben Azzai** does not consider this to be a significant refutation.
    - **Q:** Why doesn't **Ben Azzai** use this kal v'chomer to say that an asham should also be passul if offered not lishma? **A:** A Pesach, chatas, and olah can all be offered by the tzibbur, whereas an asham cannot. Therefore, it cannot be grouped with them.
    - We can also say that **Ben Azzai's** view is based on a kabbalah that he had, and the reason **R' Huna** said the kal v'chomer (which was flawed) was to sharpen the analytical abilities of his talmidim.