



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

Zevachim Daf Zayin

- 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 korban).
 - **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 olah 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 korban 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 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 chayuv 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 lamincha...”. A Braisa says, the next pasuk that says “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).