



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

Zevachim Daf Yud Beis

- **R' Oshaya** had said that **Ben Beseira** holds that a Korbon Pesach offered for its sake on the morning of Erev Pesach is valid. The Gemara refuted this view. The Gemara now says, **R' Yochanan** says that **Beb Beseira** holds that a Korbon Pesach offered on the morning of Erev Pesach is *not* valid, whether offered for its sake or not for its sake, since part of that day is fit for the shechting of the Pesach.
 - **Q: R' Avahu** asked, if this is true, then what would be the case of a valid Korbon Pesach? If the animal was designated on the morning of the 14th (Erev Pesach), since it is not fit to be brought as any korbon then it should become rejected at the moment that it is made hekdesch!? Even if it was designated a day earlier (when it could have been offered as a shelamim), when Erev Pesach morning arrives it is no longer fit to be offered at all, and should become rejected at that time!? **A: R' Avahu** said, it must be that the animal was designated as a Pesach on Erev Pesach after chatzos. **A2: Abaye** said, it may even be designated on the morning of Erev Pesach, since it will be valid as a Pesach later that same day, it is not considered to be not fit in the sense that it will make it rejected. **A3: R' Pappa** said, it may even be designated the night before, and since it will be valid as a Pesach later the next day, it is not considered to be not fit in the sense that it will make it rejected. We see this from **R' Apturiki** in a Braisa taught by **R' Yishmael**.
 - **R' Zeira** said to **R' Avahu**, this would seem to mean that **R' Yochanan** holds that living things can become rejected from being offered on the Mizbe'ach!? **R' Avahu** said, this is correct, as we find that **R' Yochanan** says, if there is an animal belonging to two partners and one of the partners makes his half hekdesch, and he then buys the other half and makes it hekdesch as well, the entire animal is kadosh, but it may not be offered on the Mizbe'ach, and it is subject to the concept of temurah. From this statement we see three things: we see that a living animal can become permanently rejected from being able to be offered on the Mizbe'ach, we see that even if something is rejected at the time that it becomes hekdesch it is considered to be a full rejection, and we see that even something that only has monetary kedusha can become permanently rejected.
 - **Ulla in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if someone ate "cheilev", separated a korbon chatas to bring for the aveirah, and then became a "mumar", and he then came back to Judaism, he cannot use that korbon, because once it was pushed away it remains pushed away. Similarly, **R' Yirmiya in the name of R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if someone ate "cheilev", separated a korbon chatas to bring for the aveirah, and then became a shoteh, and he then became sane again, he cannot use that korbon, because once it was pushed away it remains pushed away.
 - Both these cases are needed. If we would only have the first one we would say that in that case he is the one who made the korbon passul, but in the second case it happened on its own (so maybe it does not remain passul). If we would only have the second case we would say it remains passul because he does not have the ability to regain his sanity, but in the first case he can decide to come back to Judaism (so maybe it does not remain passul).
 - **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, what if someone ate cheilev, separated a chatas for the aveira, and then Beis Din paskened that cheilev is mutar, and they then retracted their psak. Do we say that the chatas is permanently rejected or not? **A:** A certain elder said, when **R' Yochanan** would discuss the cases of rejection he would begin with this very case. The reason is that in this case (as opposed to the two cases above) it is not the person who became rejected, rather it is the animal that became rejected.

- **Q:** Why is the singular word of “zaken” used to refer to the entire Sanhedrin? **A:** He was saying that they were all of the same opinion regarding this.

LO HOSIF BEN AZZAI ELAH HA’OLAH

- **R’ Huna** said, **Ben Azzai’s** view is based on the pasuk of “olah hu”, which teaches that an olah must be offered lishma, and is passul if it is not.
 - **Q:** The pasuk of asham also says “hu”, so why don’t we say it must also be offered lishma and if not it is passul? **A:** That “hu” is written in the pasuk which talks about after the burning of the required parts of the animal on the Mizbe’ach. Now, even that burning is not essential, so we can’t say that the “hu” is teaching that something is essential.
 - **Q:** The “hu” of olah is also written after the burning of the pieces on the Mizbe’ach!? **A:** There are two “hu” written regarding olah.
 - **Q:** There are also two “hu” written regarding asham!? **A:** Rather, **Ben Azzai** learns his halacha based on a kal v’chomer – if a chatas, which is not entirely burned, must be offered lishma, then certainly an olah, which is entirely burned, must be offered lishma.
 - **Q:** We can ask that a chatas brings a kapparah, and maybe that is why it must be offered lishma!? **A:** Pesach does not bring a kapparah and yet it must be offered lishma.
 - **Q:** Pesach may only be offered at a fixed time, and maybe that is why it must be offered lishma!? **A:** Chatas can be offered at any time, and yet it must be offered lishma. We will go back and forth, with the result being that there is a tzad hashava that they are both kodashim, which if shechted not lishma become passul. We can put olah into this category as well.
 - **Q:** We can ask that Pesach and chatas are different in that they involve kares, which olah does not!? **A:** **Ben Azzai** does not consider this to be a significant refutation.
 - **Q:** Why doesn’t **Ben Azzai** use this kal v’chomer to say that an asham should also be passul if offered not lishma? **A:** A Pesach, chatas, and olah can all be offered by the tzibbur, whereas an asham cannot. Therefore, it cannot be grouped with them.
 - We can also say that **Ben Azzai’s** view is based on a kabbalah that he had, and the reason **R’ Huna** said the kal v’chomer (which was flawed) was to sharpen the analytical abilities of his talmidim.