



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

Zevachim Daf Tes

- **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 yihyeh 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 asham, because an asham 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 asham, 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' 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:** Their 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.
 - **Others** 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 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**.