



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

Zevachim Daf Yud Aleph

- A Mishna says, **R' Akiva** said, if the blood of any korban that is supposed to be offered on the outside Mizbe'ach is instead offered on the inside Mizbe'ach, the korban 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 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 (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 fulfillment. Similarly, the other cases of the Mishna must mean that they are valid but do not effect fulfillment of any obligation.

- **Q:** Why can't we say that that part of the Mishna doesn't refer to fulfillment 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 13th of Nissem. **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 ahad 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.

- **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!