



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

Zevachim Daf Chuf Tes

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “v’ihm hei’achol yei’acheil mibsar zevach shelamav”. **R’ Eliezer** said, listen close and I will explain that this pasuk is referring to a person who intends to eat from the korbon beyond its allowable time. You may say that it refers to someone who actually eats from the korbon after its allowable time, however that cannot be. If the korbon was already valid with all the avodos having been properly done, eating from it after its time cannot then make it passul and ineffective! **R’ Akiva** said, why do you say that cannot be? We find a similar concept regarding a zav and zava who have a chazaka of tahara, and yet, as soon as they see a discharge it removes them from their presumed state of tahara. The same can be with this korbon – although it was valid with valid avodos it may then become invalid! **R’ Eliezer** said, the pasuk says “hamakriv”, which means that the psul was done during the time of offering, which therefore must refer to an intent, and not to an actual eating on the third day. You may ask that “hamakriv” doesn’t teach this, but rather teaches that the Kohen becomes passul to do Avodah, I will say that this can’t be, because the pasuk says “oso”, which teaches that it is only the korbon that becomes passul, not the Kohen. **Ben Azzai** says that “oso” teaches that the psul of piggul makes the korbon not be accepted, but someone who delays the bringing of his korbon neder would not risk the korbon not being accepted. **Others** say, the pasuk says “lo yeichasheiv”, which teaches that it is a bad intent to eat the korbon after its allowable time that causes the korbon to be passul, not the actual eating after the allowable time.
 - **Q:** How does **Ben Azzai** learn that it is only the korbon that becomes passul, and not the Kohen? **A:** Either he learns it from the drasha of the **Others**, or he learns it from the words “lo yeiratzeh”, which is language that is appropriate for a korbon, not for the Kohen.
 - **Q:** We see in a Braisa that there is another basis for saying that a delayed korbon does not become ineffective, based on comparing all korbanos to bechor, which itself is compared to maaser sheini, and this hekesh teaches that just as maaser sheini doesn’t become passul after a year, neither does bechor (although at that point it has been delayed in coming). If so, why did **Ben Azzai** need to learn this from “oso”? **A:** If we only had the pasuk of bechor we would say that bechor is different because it is not being brought for a purpose of kapparah or appeasement. However, a korbon that is brought for that purpose may become ineffective if it was delayed in being brought.
 - **Q:** Another Gemara learns another basis for saying that a delayed korbon does not become ineffective, based on the pasuk of “v’haya becha cheit”, which teaches that the person has sinned by delaying the korbon, but there is no psul in the korbon itself!? **A:** **R’ Ben Azzai** uses this pasuk to teach that it is only the person who has sinned, and not the person’s wife. We find the concept that a person’s wife is punished if a person does not repay for items he stole. We would think that in this situation she would be punished as well (for not bringing the korbon when he was supposed to). The pasuk of “v’haya becha cheit” teaches that she is not punished for this.
 - **Q:** What does **R’ Eliezer** do with the pasuk of “lo yeichasheiv”, which the **Others** used to teach that the korbon becomes passul for bad intent? **A:** He uses it for the drasha of **R’ Yannai**, which says, that if there is another intent mixed in with the piggul intent, the korbon does not become piggul.
 - **R’ Mari** said, that **R’ Yannai** said, that “lo yeichasheiv” creates a chiyuv malkus for one who has piggul intention.
 - **Q:** **R’ Ashi** asked, this is a lav without an action, and there is no malkus for such a lav!? **A:** **R’ Mari** said, this follows **R’ Yehuda**, who says that even such a lav gets malkus.

MISHNA

- The general rule is, anyone who shechts, does kabbalah, holacha, or zrika with intent to eat something that is meant to be eaten, or to burn something that is meant to be burned, and this intent was regarding something the size of a kezayis, if the intent was to eat or burn it beyond the allowable area, the korbon is passul but there is no kares if the korbon is eaten. If the intent was to eat or burn it beyond the allowable time, the korbon is piggul and there is kares if the korbon is eaten, as long as the “matir” (the blood) was offered as it is required to be.
 - What is meant that the matir is offered as it is required to be? If he shechted without saying anything (without a bad intent) and he then did the kabbalah, holacha, and zrika with intent for beyond its time, or if he shechted with intent for beyond its time and then did the kabbalah, holacha, and zrika without any bad intent, or if he shechted, and did the kabbalah, holacha, and zrika all with intent for beyond its time, this would be a case where the matir was offered as required.
 - What is meant that the matir is not offered as it is required to be? If he shechted with intent for beyond its allowable place and then did the kabbalah, holacha, and zrika with intent for beyond its time, or if he shechted with intent for beyond its allowable time and then did the kabbalah, holacha, and zrika with intent for beyond its allowable place, or if he did the shechita, kabbalah, holacha, and zrika with intent for beyond its allowable place, or in the case of a Pesach or chatas he shechted it not for its sake and then did the kabbalah, holacha, and zrika with intent for beyond its time, or if he shechted with intent for beyond its time and then did the kabbalah, holacha, and zrika with intent for beyond its allowable place, or if he did the shechita, kabbalah, holacha, and zrika not for its own sake, these would be cases of where the matir was not offered as it is required to be.
 - If the Kohen intended to eat a kezayis beyond its allowable place and then intended to eat a kezayis beyond its time, or visa-versa, or he intended to eat a half of a kezayis beyond its allowable place and then intended to eat a half kezayis beyond its time, or visa-versa, the korbon will be passul but there will not be kares for then eating the korbon. **R’ Yehuda** says, the general rule is, if the intent regarding beyond its time precedes the intent for beyond its allowable place, the korbon becomes piggul and there is kares. If the intent for beyond its allowable place precedes the intent for beyond its time, the korbon is passul and there is no kares. The **Chachomim** say that in either case the korbon is passul and there is no kares.
 - If there is intent to eat a half of a kezayis and to burn a half of a kezayis beyond its allowable place or beyond its time, the korbon is valid, because eating and burning do not combine.

GEMARA

- **Ilfa** said, the machlokes between the **T”K** and **R’ Yehuda** is regarding when the two intents are had during two avodos, but if the two intents were had during a single avodah all would agree that there is a mixing of intents and there is no piggul. **R’ Yochanan** said, the machlokes is even when both intents were had during a single avodah.
 - **Q:** The view of **Ilfa** makes sense – since the beginning of the Mishna is discussing two avodos, the machlokes is also in a case of two avodos. However, according to **R’ Yochanan**, can we say that the beginning of the Mishna discusses two avodos and the machlokes is discussing a case of one avodah!? **A:** Yes, the beginning of the Mishna discusses two avodos and the machlokes is discussing a case of one avodah or a case of two avodos.
 - **Q:** The Mishna said that **R’ Yehuda** gave a “general rule”. Now, according to **Ilfa** this is not a general rule, because it depends on whether the intents were had in one avodah or in two avodos!? This remains a KASHYEH.