



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

Zevachim Daf Daled

- **Q:** How do we know that a korbon must be shechted for its own sake? **A:** The pasuk says "v'ihm zevach shelamim korbano", which we darshen to mean, the shechita (zevach) should be for the sake of a shelamim.
 - **Q:** Maybe "zevach shelamim" is simply the name of the korbon? **A:** Other pesukim mention shelamim without mentioning "zevach". Clearly then, it is not part of the name.
- **Q:** How do we know that the other blood related Avodos (kabbalah, holacha, and zrika) have to be done with intent for the sake of the korbon? You can't say we learn them from shechita, because we find that shechita is treated more stringently in that if the shechita of a Korbon Pesach is done for the sake of people who are not included in the group of this Korbon Pesach, the korbon is passul!? **A:** Rather, the pasuk says "hamakriv es dam hashelamim", which teaches that the kabbalah must be done for the sake of the shelamim.
 - **Q:** Why couldn't we learn out shechita from kabbalah? **A:** Kabbalah is passul if done by a woman or a non-Kohen, whereas shechita is not.
- **Q:** Now we have a source for shechita and kabbalah. How do we know that the zrika must be done for its sake as well? It can't be learned from shechita and kabbalah, because those are more stringent in that they must be done in the North of the Azarah, and they are done even for chatas korbanos that are offered on the inside Mizbe'ach (which does not have "zrika", which refers to offering of the blood on the outside Mizbe'ach)! **A:** Rather, the pasuk says "hazoreik es dam hashelamim", which teaches that the zrika must be done for the sake of the shelamim.
 - **Q:** Why couldn't we learn the other Avodos from zrika? **A:** Zrika is more stringent in that a non-Kohen who does zrika is chayuv misah bidei Shamayim.
- **Q:** We now have a source for everything but holacha. We can't learn it from the others, because all the other Avodos are things which can't be bypassed, but holacha could be bypassed (if the korbon is shechted right next to the Mizbe'ach). So, how do we know that holacha must be done for the sake of the korbon? **A:** The pasuk says "v'hikriv...es hakol...hamizbeichah", which refers to the bringing of the pieces to the Mizbe'ach. A Braisa says that the pasuk of "v'hikrivu" refers to kabbalah, which is written in verbiage of holachah. This teaches that holachah is included in the halachos of kabbalah, and therefore must also be done for its sake.
- **Q:** We now have a source for all the blood Avodos regarding intent for the sake of the proper korbon. How do we know that they must also all be done for the sake of the true owner? **A: R' Pinchas the son of R' Ami** said, the pasuk says "ubisar zevach todas shilamav", which teaches that the shechita of a todah should be for its sake. Now, this is not needed to teach regarding intent for sake of the korbon, because that has already been learned. Rather, it must be coming to teach regarding intent for the proper owner.
 - **Q:** The pasuk is not available to teach this, because a Braisa uses this pasuk to teach that a todah shechted for the sake of a shelamim is valid, but a shelamim shechted for the sake of a todah is passul!? **A:** We are darshening from the word "zevach", and that is not used in the Braisa's drasha.
 - **Q:** A Braisa uses the word "zevach" to teach that a chatas and asham are like a todah in that they can also only be eaten for one day and one night!? **A:** For this drasha the word "zevach" should have been written at the end of the pasuk. The fact that it is written at the beginning of the pasuk allows us to make both drashos.
- **Q:** We now have a source that the shechita must be done for the sake of the proper owner. How do we know that the other Avodos must be done with that intent as well? You can't say we learn them from shechita, because we find shechita is treated more stringently in that if the shechita of a Korbon Pesach is done for the sake of people who are not included in the group of

this Korbon Pesach, the korbon is passul!? **A:** The pasuk taught regarding shechita and the intent for the proper korbon and also taught regarding shechita and the intent for the proper owner. Just as regarding the intent for the proper korbon there is no difference between shechita and the other Avodos, so too with regard to intent for the proper owners there is no difference between shechita and the other Avodos.

- **Q:** We can ask, the required intent for the proper korbon is different than the required intent for the proper owner, because the intent for the proper korbon is a psul in the korbon itself, and it applies to all the Avodos equally, whereas the intent for the proper owner only applies when the intent during the Avodos is to do the *zrika* for a different owner, it applies even after the death of the owner, and it applies to a korbon of the *tzibbur* just as it does to a korbon of an individual, and even though two of these four points are not truly good points, still we have the two others which are good differentiators!? The reason why two of the points are not valid points is as follows. The first point was that intent for a different owner is not a psul in the korbon itself, presumably because it is mere intent. The psul of intent for the wrong korbon is also mere intent and yet it makes it passul!? Also, the second point is not valid, because **R' Pinchas the son of R' Mari** holds that intent for the wrong owner does apply after death of the owner!? Still, the other two points are valid points, so how do we know that the other Avodos must be done with intent for the proper owner as well? **A:** Rather, **R' Ashi** said, the pasuk says "v'nirtza lo l'chaper alav". This teaches that the *zrika* must be done for *him* – for the proper owner.
 - **Q: R' Shimon** in a Braisa uses this pasuk to teach that when one says "harei alai" he bears responsibility for the korbon!? **A: R' Ashi** is darshening the word "lo" and **R' Shimon** darshens the word "alav".
- **Q:** We now have a source that the shechita and *zrika* must be done for the sake of the proper owner. How do we know that the kabbalah must be done with that intent as well? You can't say that we learn it from shechita and *zrika*, because shechita and *zrika* make a person chayuv if he does them outside the Beis Hamikdash, whereas kabbalah does not!? **A:** Rather, **R' Ashi** said, the pasuk regarding a nazir's korbon says "v'es ha'ayil yaaseh zevach shelamim", which teaches that the Avodos must be done for the sake of a shelamim. Now, this is not needed to teach that, because that was learned as explained previously. Therefore, say that this teaches that the Avodos must be done with intent for the proper owners.
 - **Q: R' Acha bar Abbah** asked **Rava**, maybe "yaaseh" is a klal and "zevach" is a prat, and therefore only shechting is included in this requirement, but nothing else is included? **A:** The word *yaaseh* is describing the shelamim. Since it is separated from the word shelamim, it can't be darshened as a klal uprat. **A2: Ravina** said, it can be darshened as a klal uprat, but the word "LaHashem" which is written later in the pasuk is another klal, and therefore we have a klal uprat uklal, which would include other things that are like the prat as well – just as the prat (shechita) is an Avoda and must be done for the sake of the korbon, so too other Avodos must be done for the sake of the korbon, and since this teaching is not needed (because it has already been learned from other pesukim) it must be coming to teach that they need intent for the proper owner.
 - **Q:** Maybe say that just as shechita is something for which one is chayuv if he does it to a korbon outside the Beis Hamikdash, so too the other things learned from this klal uprat uklal must be something for which one would be chayuv when done outside the Beis Hamikdash – which would allow inclusion of *zrika*, but not the other Avodos!? Or maybe say that just as shechita must be done in the North of the Azara and applies to a chatas that is offered on the inside Mizbe'ach, so too only the other Avodos that must be done in the North of the Azara and apply to a chatas offered on the inside Mizbe'ach are included – which would allow for inclusion of kabbalah, but not *zrika*!? **A:** Since these are both equally important characteristics, we learn both of them and can include all, because there would be no reason to exclude one more than the other. **A2:** We can also answer that *zrika* is learned from the drasha of **R' Ashi** stated above. The klal uprat uklal would therefore be used to include kabbalah.
- **Q:** We now know that the korbon of a nazir must be offered for the sake of the owner. How do we know that this is true for other types of shelamim as well? It can't be learned from nazir,

because the nazir must bring other korbanos along with his shelamim and maybe it is therefore more stringent in that way!? **A:** If the pasuk only meant to teach regarding the korban of a nazir the pasuk should have used the word “shalmei” not “shelamim”. The use of the word “shelamim” teaches that this applies to all types of korban shelamim.

- **Q:** We now know that a shelamim must be offered for the sake of the korban and of the owner. How do we know that this is true for other types of korbanos as well? They can't be learned from shelamim, because a shelamim is more stringent in that it needs semicha, nesachim, and tenufas chazeh v'shok!? **A:** Rather, the pasuk says “zos hatorah la'olah lamincha v'lachatas v'la'asham v'lamilu'im ulizevach hashelamim”. The pasuk compares all other korbanos to a shelamim – just as a shelamim must be offered for the sake of the korban and for the sake of the owner, the same is true for the other korbanos as well.
- **Q:** We now see that there is a requirement that the korbanos be offered for their own sake. If so, why are they still valid (other than a chatas and a Pesach) when they are offered not for their own sake? **A:** The pasuk says “motza sifasecha tishmor v'asisa kasher nadarta laHashem Elokecha nedava...” The pasuk refers to the korban as a neder and then as a nedava – this doesn't make sense!? Rather, the pasuk is teaching that if the korban was brought properly, it will be considered a fulfillment of the obligation of the owner. If not, it will not fulfil the obligation, but will still be treated as a nedava. We see that even when offered not for its sake it is still a valid korban.
 - We need the pasuk of “motza sifasecha” and the pasuk of “zos hatorah”. If we only had “motza sifasecha” we would not know that it is referring to the requirement that it be offered for its sake. Therefore we need the pasuk of “zos hatorah” to teach that we are referring to the lishmah requirement. If we would only have the pasuk of “zos hatorah” we would think that if the korban was offered not for its sake it becomes passul. Therefore, we need the pasuk of “motza sifasecha” to teach that it remains valid.