



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

Zevachim Daf Mem Daled

KOL SHEYEISH LO MATIRIN BEIN LA'ADAM BEIN LAMIZBE'ACH...

- A Braisa said, that although the pasuk of piggul speaks specifically of a shelamim, we learn from a gezeira shava to extend that to other korbanos as well. The Braisa then says, maybe the pasuk means to limit the concept of piggul to shelamim, which we should only extend to other korbanos that are similarly eaten for 2 days and one night? How do we know to include korbanos that are only eaten for one day and one night? The pasuk therefore uses the extra word of "mibsar", which teaches to include all korbanos from which meat is eaten. How do we know that even an olah is subject to piggul? The pasuk says "zevach", to include an olah. How do we know to include korbanos of birds and menachos and the log of oil of a metzora? The pasuk says "asher heim makdishim li", to include even these. Since we end up including all these other korbanos, why does the pasuk only talk in terms of a shelamim? It is to teach that just as a shelamim has a matir for the Mizbe'ach and people, so too, only korbanos which have a matir for the Mizbe'ach or people are subject to piggul: with regard to an olah, its blood is a matir for its meat to be offered on the Mizbe'ach and for its hide to go to the Kohanim, with regard to a bird olah, its blood is a matir for its meat to be offered on the Mizbe'ach, with regard to a bird chatas, its blood is a matir for its meat to be eaten by the Kohanim, with regard to the korbanos offered on the inner Mizbe'ach (which are then burned outside) its blood is matir the eimurim to be offered on the Mizbe'ach. We would exclude the kometz, ketores, levonah, the mincha of a Kohen, the mincha of the Kohen Gadol, blood, and nesachim that are brought on their own. **R' Shimon** says, any korbon that is not offered on the outside Mizbe'ach like a shelamim would not be subject to piggul, which excludes the korbanos offered on the inner Mizbe'ach from being subject to piggul.
 - **Q:** What would be considered "similar to a shelamim"? **A:** It is a bechor, which is also eaten for 2 days and one night.
 - **Q:** How would we have learned bechor from shelamim? We could ask that shelamim is different in that it requires semicha, nesachim, and tenufah!? **A:** Rather, it would be learned from the words "v'ihm hei'achol yei'acheil" which are two klalos, and shelamim is a prat, and we would therefore darshen a klal uprat uklal. Although the two klalos are written next to each other with the prat not being in between, **Rava** has said that in such a case we view the prat as if it was written in between and we darshen as a klal uprat uklal.
 - **Q:** When the Braisa says that the oil of the metzora is subject to piggul it is following the view of **R' Meir**, who says this in a Braisa. However, when the Braisa then excludes nesachim from piggul, that follows the view of the **Rabanan** in a Braisa!? **A:** **R' Yosef** said, that the Braisa follows the view of **Rebbi**, who we find to hold that the oil of a metzora is subject to piggul, but who also agrees with the **Rabanan** regarding nesachim.
 - **Q:** **R' Yirmiya** asked, we see in a Braisa that all agree that the sprinkling of the oil cannot make it subject to piggul. It is only **R' Meir** who says that when the oil is brought at the time that the korbon is brought, the oil is subject to piggul. If so, it can't be that **Rebbi** holds that the sprinkling of the oil alone makes it subject to piggul!? **A:** Rather, **R' Yirmiya** said, the Braisa follows the view of **R' Meir** and we must delete mention of nesachim from the later part of the Braisa. **A2:** **Abaye** said, we don't need to delete nesachim. The mention of oil refers to oil that is brought along with the korbon, and that would be true for nesachim that were brought along with the korbon as well. The mention of nesachim refers to nesachim brought on their own, and the same would be true for the oil brought on its own.

- The Gemara quotes a Braisa taught by **Levi** that gives the source for the Kohanim eating the meat of a chatas bird.
 - The Braisa says, among the things given to Kohanim the pasuk says “kol korbanam”, which comes to include the log of oil of a metzorah. The Gemara says, we would think the pasuk of “min ha’aish” excludes the oil, since it is not put on the Mizbe’ach.
 - The Braisa says, “l’chol minchasam” includes the mincha of the Omer and the mincha of a sotah. We would think based on the pasuk that the Kohen only gets to eat from korbanos that are brought for a kapparah, and these are not brought for a kapparah.
 - The Braisa says, “ulichol chatasam” includes the chatas bird. We would think that this is not included because it is a neveilah.
 - The Braisa says, “l’chol ashmam” includes the ashmam of a nazir and of a metzora. We would think he does not get these because these are brought to make these people valid, not for a kapparah.
 - **Q:** The pasuk specifically says that the Kohen eats from the ashmam of a metzorah!? **A:** Rather, the pasuk comes to include the ashmam of a nazir.
 - The Braisa says, “asher yashivu” includes the property stolen from a ger who then died.
 - The Braisa says, “lecha hu” comes to teach that it belongs to the Kohen to the extent that he can even be mekadesh a woman with it.
- A Braisa says, **R’ Elazar in the name of R’ Yose** said, if (regarding the korbanos that are offered on the inside Mizbe’ach) he had a piggul intent regarding something that is done outside the Heichal, it becomes piggul. If he had an intent regarding something that is done inside the heichal, it is not piggul. For example, if he was standing outside the Heichal and said that he is shechting with intent to apply the blood beyond its time, it is not piggul, because this is an intent outside regarding something done inside. If he was standing inside and said that he is applying the blood with the intent to offer the eimurim or pour the leftover blood the next day, it is also not piggul, because this is an intent inside regarding something to be done outside. However, if he was standing outside and shechted with intent to pour the leftover blood the next day or to offer the eimurim the next day, it would be piggul, because it is an intent had outside regarding something done on the outside.
 - **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** said, the pasuk regarding the Kohen Gadol’s par says “kasher yuram mishor zevach hashelamim”, which compares it to a shelamim and teaches that it is like a shelamim and only becomes piggul when the action and intent relates to the outside Mizbe’ach.
 - **R’ Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha in the name of Rav** said, the halacha follows **R’ Elazar in the name of R’ Yose**.
 - **R’ Yosef** asked, are we paskening for the times of Moshiach!? **Abaye** said, you can say the same thing regarding learning of all the korbanos! Rather, we learn and are rewarded for doing so. The same is regarding the death penalties. **R’ Yosef** said, I was asking as to why we need to come out with a psak, not why we are learning this altogether.