



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

Zevachim Daf Yud Daled

R' SHIMON MACHSHIR B'HILUCH

- **Reish Lakish** said, **R' Shimon** would agree that the holacha of a chatas offered on the inside Mizbe'ach done with the intent of piggul would make the korbon piggul, because the korbon could not be offered without this holacha.
 - **Q: R' Shimon** has said that piggul only applies for a korbon that is brought on the outside Mizbe'ach!? **A: R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said, although he says that such a korbon could not become piggul, he would agree that the korbon becomes passul with that intent, based on a kal v'chomer – if the psul of lishma, which doesn't apply to shelamim applies to chatas, then the psul of piggul, which does apply to shelamim, will certainly apply to a chatas.
 - **Q:** We now see that he says the psul of piggul (that the korbon will be eaten or offered beyond its allowable time) applies to a chatas offered on the inside Mizbe'ach. How does he know that the psul of an intent that the korbon will be eaten or offered outside of its allowable place also applies to such a chatas? It can't be learned from piggul, because piggul is different in that it carries kares!? It also can't be learned from the case of not lishma, because that applied even to a korbon offered on a "bamah" whereas "outside of its allowable place" did not!? **A:** The intent of not lishma is only a psul for chatas and Pesach, and chatas and Pesach were never allowed to be brought on a bamah. **A2:** When the pasuk says "shlishi" it refers to an intention for beyond its time, and when it says "piggul" it refers to an intention of outside its allowable place. The mention of both in the same pasuk creates a hekesh between the two.
 - **Rava** said, if **R' Shimon** agrees with his son **R' Elazar**, that the space between the Mizbe'ach and the Ulam is considered to be "the north of the Azarah", then intent during the holacha for an inside chatas would not be effective unless the Kohen had the intent from the point of the doorway of the Ulam and further inside beyond that.
 - Also, if he holds like **R' Yehuda**, who says that the floor of the Azarah between the Mizbe'ach and the Ulam can make things kadosh like the Mizbe'ach itself, then when the Kohen carries out the "bazichin" from the Shulchan (which is the equivalent to the Lechem Hapanim of taking blood of an animal to the Mizbe'ach), the only time a piggul intent would create a problem would be when that intent was had before he leaves the Ulam. Once he leaves, it would no longer create piggul.
 - Further, if he holds that the Ulam and the Heichal have the same kedusha, then the only place where piggul intent would create a problem would be while he is walking in the doorway of the Ulam.
 - Further, if he holds that the doorway has the same kedusha as the Ulam itself, the only time that piggul intent would be effective would be when he stretches out his hand from the doorway of the Ulam into the Azarah.
 - Further, if he holds that carrying not by foot (e.g. by stretching out the hand) is not considered to be a holacha, then there would be no time at all that a piggul intent would create a problem.
- **Abaye** said to the one who would loudly repeat the shiur of **R' Chisda**, ask **R' Chisda** what the halacha is if holacha is done by a non-Kohen. **R' Chisda** told him it would be valid, as can be seen from a pasuk which says that the Kohanim took the blood of the Pesach from the hands of the one who shechted it and threw it onto the Mizbe'ach. Since the shechita can be done by a non-Kohen, that means the holacha here could have been done by a non-Kohen as well.

- **Q: R' Sheishes** asked, a Braisa clearly says it would be passul!? **TEYUFTA!**
 - **Q: R' Chisda** had a pasuk that supported him!? **A:** The pasuk is referring to where the non-Kohen held the blood, without moving it at all ("he acted like a pillar").
- **Rabbah and R' Yosef** both said, that whether a holacha done by a non-Kohen is valid is actually a machlokes between **R' Shimon and the Rabanan** – according to **R' Shimon** who says that an avodah that a korbon can be done without is not an avodah, he would say this holacha is valid. According to the **Rabanan** it would be passul.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, shechita is an avodah that a korbon can't be done without, and yet it is valid when done by a non-Kohen!? **A:** They answered that shechita is not an avodah.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Zeira** learns from a pasuk that the shechita of a para adumah by a non-Kohen is passul, which means that it is an avodah!? **A:** A para adumah only has monetary kedusha and therefore the shechita is not an avodah at all. The reason it needs a Kohen is based on the pasuk.
 - **Q:** We should say that if the Kohen is needed for something which only has monetary kedusha and therefore shows that its shechita is an avodah, it should surely be needed for something that has full kedusha and its shechita should certainly be considered an avodah!? **A: R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said, we find that tzaraas must be seen by a Kohen, and that has nothing to do with it being an avodah. The same is true for shechita.
 - **Q:** The taking of the limbs to the Mizbe'ach is an avodah that a korbon can be brought without, and yet a pasuk teaches that it must be done by a Kohen!? **A:** Where the pasuk requires it, a Kohen is needed. Otherwise, for such an avodah a Kohen is not needed.
 - **Q:** If taking the limbs to the Mizbe'ach, which is not needed to bring a kapparah, needs a Kohen, then surely taking the blood to the Mizbe'ach, which is needed to bring a kapparah, should need to be done by a Kohen!? **A:** In fact, we have learned that **Ulla in the name of R' Elazar** said that holacha done by a non-Kohen would be passul even according to **R' Shimon**.
- **Q:** Is holacha without moving the feet (the Kohen stands still and passes it along closer to the Mizbe'ach) considered to be "holacha" or not? **A:** A Braisa says that holacha done while sitting is passul. That would suggest that if he is standing similar to sitting (i.e. he passes it along while standing still) it would be valid.
 - This is no proof. The case of sitting may be that he drags himself along while sitting, and the similar case of standing would be that he drags his feet along instead of walking. However, it may be that standing still is not considered to be a holacha.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from a Mishna that says that on Erev Pesach the blood of the Pesach was passed along from one Kohen to the next until it reached the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** It may be that the Kohen shuffled his feet a little, and didn't remain perfectly in place.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from another Mishna that says, if a valid Kohen gave the blood to a passul Kohen, it must be returned to the valid Kohen. This shows that passing it to the passul Kohen is not called holacha!? **A:** It may be that it is a holacha and his handing it to the passul Kohen and then taking it from him is therefore considered a valid holacha for that distance of space.
 - We have learned that **Ulla in the name of R' Yochanan** said that a holacha without moving the feet is not considered to be a holacha.
 - **Q:** If this was done, can it now be rectified by taking the blood back to the starting point and doing a proper holacha? **A:** From the fact that the Mishna quoted above says that the valid Kohen should take it back from the passul Kohen, it must be that it is able to rectified (for the distance covered by giving it to the passul Kohen).

- This is no proof. It may be that the passul Kohen was further away from the Mizbe'ach than the valid Kohen when it was handed to the passul Kohen, and therefore no distance was travelled by handing it to the passul Kohen.