



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

Zevachim Daf Mem Hey

MISHNA

- With regard to the korbanos brought by goyim, one would not be chayuv kares for piggul, nossar, or tamei. Also, one who shechts them outside the Mikdash would be patur. This is the view of **R' Shimon**. However, **R' Yose** says one would be chayuv.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, with regard to kodashim of goyim: **R' Shimon** says one may not have hana'ah from them, but would not be oiver me'ilah if he did, one would not be chayuv kares for piggul, nossar, or tamei on account of them, they cannot make another animal into temurah, and the goyim don't bring nesachim along with the korbanos although the korbon is required to have nesachim along with it. **R' Yose** says, my view in all these halachos is to be machmir, because the pasuk regarding the korbanos of goyim says "LaHashem". The Braisa says, when does **R' Shimon** say that the one who benefits from it would not be oiver me'ilah, that is only regarding the korbon of a goy. However, if the goy gave kodshei bedek habayis, there would be me'ilah attached to it.
 - "One may not have hana'ah, but would not be oiver me'ilah" – he may not have hana'ah based on a gezeira D'Rabanan, but there is no me'ilah, because he learns me'ilah from a gezeira shava from terumah, and regarding terumah the pasuk says "Bnei Yisrael", which teaches that it does not apply to korbanos of goyim.
 - "One would not be chayuv kares for piggul, nossar, or tamei on account of them" – piggul is learned from a gezeira shava from nossar, and nossar is learned from a gezeira shava from tumah, and regarding tumah the pasuk says "Bnei Yisrael".
 - "They cannot make another animal into temurah" – there is a hekesh between temurah and animal maaser, and there is another hekesh between animal maaser and produce maaser, and regarding produce maaser the pasuk says "Bnei Yisrael".
 - **Q:** How could something that was learned through a hekesh then be used to teach further through another hekesh!? **A:** This is only not allowed regarding matters of kodashim, and produce maaser is not kodashim.
 - **Q:** That is true if we follow the "teacher" when determining if something is kodashim, but if we look at what is being learned, it is kodashim (it is temurah)!? **A:** Rather, animal maaser is an obligatory korbon that has no fixed time to be offered. Such a korbon is brought only by Yidden. A hekesh then teaches that the same is true for temurah, that it too can only be created from the korbanos of Yidden.
 - "The goyim don't bring nesachim" – a Braisa says, the pasuk regarding nesachim says "ezrach", which teaches that only Yidden bring nesachim, not goyim. However, the pasuk says "kacha" which teaches that their korbanos must have nesachim (they either give the money and we buy the nesachim, or we bring nesachim from the communal fund).
 - "Regarding kodshei bedek habayis given by a goy, there would be me'ilah" – he holds that me'ilah is learned from terumah and therefore is limited to "Bnei Yisrael" only when it is like terumah in that it has physical kedusha. However, if the item only has monetary kedusha it would not be limited to "Bnei Yisrael".
 - A Braisa says, if blood became tamei and was then offered on the Mizbe'ach, if it was done b'shogeg, the korbon is accepted. If it was done b'meizid, the korbon is not accepted. This is for individual korbanos. With regard to korbanos of the tzibbur it is accepted whether it was done b'shogeg or b'meizid. With regard to the korbanos of goyim, whether it was done b'shogeg or b'meizid it is not accepted.

- The **Rabanan** said to **R' Pappa**, this Braisa would seem not to follow **R' Yose**, because he says that the korbon of a goy is treated in all respects like the korbon of a Yid. **R' Pappa** said, even **R' Yose** would agree with this Braisa, because the pasuk regarding the tzitz says "lahem", which teaches that the tzitz only brings acceptance for the korbon of a Yid, not of a goy.
 - **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Nosson** said to **R' Pappa**, the pasuk regarding tumah says "asher heim makdishim", which according to you should limit tumah to the korbanos of Yidden, and yet **R' Yose** says it applies to the korbanos of goyim as well!? **A:** Rather, **R' Ashi** said, the pasuk regarding the tzitz says "l'ratzon lahem", and goyim are not fit for "finding favor" in the eyes of Hashem.

MISHNA

- Things for which one would not be chayuv on them for piggul (the kometz, ketores, etc.), one would still be chayuv on them for nossar and tamei, except for blood. **R' Shimon** holds that one is chayuv only when he eats something that is normally eaten, but for eating wood, levonah, or ketores, one would not be chayuv for eating them when there is tumah.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, we would think to say that one should only be chayuv for tumah on something that has a "matir" – either for people or for the Mizbe'ach, based on a kal v'chomer from piggul: if piggul, for which one is chayuv a fixed chatas, and for even one period of awareness, and which has no exceptions to its rule, one is only chayuv on something that has a "matir" either for people or for the Mizbe'ach, then for tumah, for which one is only chayuv a korbon oleh v'yoreid, and only when there are two periods of awareness, and which has exceptions to its rule, one should surely only be chayuv on something that has a "matir" either for people or for the Mizbe'ach! The pasuk therefore says "asher heim makdishim li", which comes to apply the halachos of tumah to all korbanos. We would think that one would be chayuv for tumah from the moment the korbon is made kadosh. The pasuk therefore says "yikrav", and **R' Elazar** explains this to mean that one is only chayuv when it is ready to be offered. This means that if it is a korbon that has a matir, it is considered "ready" once the matir has been offered, and if it has no matir it is considered "ready" when it is made kadosh in a kli shareis.
 - **Q:** We now have the source that tumah applies even to korbanos that have no "matir". How do we know that nossar applies to them as well? **A:** We have a gezeira shava of "chilul" from tumah.
 - **Q:** Why not learn it from a gezeira shava of "avon" from piggul, which would teach that it only applies when there is a matir? **A:** It is more logical to learn it from tumah, because it is similar to tumah in that they both are a psul of the body (as opposed to piggul which comes through intent), they both don't come about from the blood applications, and they are both referred to in the pasuk as "chilul".
 - **Q:** It makes more sense to learn it from piggul, because they are both similar in that they have no exception to their rules, the tzitz does not remove these psulim, they don't make the korbon tamei, they are both related to time, and they are both a psul of the korbon itself (as opposed to tumah, which refers to where the person eating it is tamei)!? In fact, there are more ways that it is similar to piggul than to tumah!? **A:** Rather, nossar is learned from the Braisa of **Levi**, which says that the fact that the pasuk regarding tumah says "v'lo yichalilu" instead of "v'lo yichalu", we learn that the pasuk is referring to two things – tumah and nossar.