



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

### Zevachim Daf Ches

- **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 "minchas" 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.
      - **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 korban 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 korban 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 korbano 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 korban, not just a shelamim.
    - **Q:** Maybe this means that whatever type of korban it was shechted for is the type of korban it becomes, and it doesn't just become a shelamim? **A:** That would be true if the pasuk had said "lishlamim l'zevach". Since the pasuk says "l'zevach shelamim" it teaches that whatever korban 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 korban 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 would be valid, but if it was shechted for the sake of a chatas or asham it would not be valid? **A:** Rather, "l'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 korban other than itself.
      - **Q:** Maybe say that it should take on the status of whatever korban it was intended for? **A: R' Avin** said, we say that a korban that was

supposed to be eaten (the Pesach) can become another korbán that is eaten (a shelamim) and will not become a korbán that cannot be eaten (an olah).

- **Q:** A chatas and asham 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 asham).