



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

Zevachim Daf Nun Zayin

HABECHOR NECHAL LAKOHANIM

- A Braisa says, how do we know that a bechor may be eaten for two days and a night? The pasuk makes a hekesh from bechor to the "chazeh v'shok" of a shelamim. This teaches that the bechor may be eaten for two days and a night, like a shelamim. This was actually a question that was posed to the Chachomim in "Kerem B'Yavneh". The question was, for how long may a bechor be eaten? **R' Tarfon** said, it may be eaten for two days and a night. **R' Yose Haglili** asked him how he knows that. **R' Tarfon** said, a shelamim is a kodshei kalim and a bechor is also a kodshei kalim, and therefore the bechor may be eaten as a shelamim may be eaten. **R' Yose Haglili** said, maybe instead make a different comparison – a bechor is a gift given to the Kohen and a chatas is a gift given to the Kohen, and therefore say that the bechor should only be eaten like the chatas, for a day and a night!? **R' Tarfon** said, bechor is more similar to shelamim, because they are both not brought for kapparah for a sin. **R' Yose Haglili** said, bechor is more similar to chatas and ashm, because they are all given to the Kohen and cannot be brought as a neder or nedavah! **R' Akiva** then jumped in and said, the pasuk makes a hekesh from bechor to the "chazeh v'shok" of a shelamim. This teaches that the bechor may be eaten for two days and a night, like a shelamim. **R' Yose Haglili** said, the pasuk only compares it to the "chazeh v'shok" without specifying of which korbon. Maybe it is comparing it to the chazeh v'shok of a Todah, which would then teach that just as a Todah is eaten for one day and a night, the same should be true for a bechor!? **R' Akiva** said, the pasuk says "ubisaram yihiyeh lach" and then ends off by saying "lecha yihiyeh". This extra phrase teaches that a bechor is "yours" for more than the minimum, and therefore can be eaten for two days and a night, like a shelamim. When this teaching of **R' Akiva** was repeated to **R' Yishmael** he told them to tell **R' Akiva** that his original answer was correct. The fact that the chazeh v'shok of a todah are given to the Kohen is itself learned from a hekesh from shelamim. Therefore, it cannot serve to teach through another hekesh.
 - **Q:** What would **R' Yishmael** learn from the extra phrase of "lecha yihiyeh"? **A:** It teaches that a bechor with a mum, which is not brought as a korbon, must still be given to the Kohen. **R' Akiva** learns this halacha from the plural use of "bisaram".
 - **Q:** What is the point of machlokes between **R' Yishmael** and **R' Akiva**? **A:** **R' Yishmael** holds that when something is learned partially via hekesh and partly not (the fact that the todah's chazeh v'shok is given to the Kohen is learned from a hekesh, but the fact that it is only eaten for a day and a night is not) it is still considered to be learned from a hekesh and therefore can't teach further via a hekesh. **R' Akiva** holds that such a situation is not considered as having been learned via a hekesh and can therefore be used to teach further via a hekesh.
 - **Q:** There is a Braisa which learns via a hekesh that the same way the Yom Kippur korbanos are sprinkled in the Kodesh Hakodashim they are again sprinkled in the Heichal towards the Paroches. Now, the sprinkling inside the Kodesh Hakodashim is itself learned partially via hekesh. According to **R' Akiva's** view this makes sense, because it may still teach further through a hekesh. However, according to **R' Yishmael's** view, how may this teach further through a hekesh? **A:** The first hekesh compares the blood of the two animals, whereas the second hekesh compares the two places. This is not considered to be a hekesh followed by another hekesh. We can also answer that the second hekesh would still exist for things stated explicitly in the pasuk regarding the sprinkling in the Kodesh Hakodashim. Once the hekesh may be used for that, it may be used to teach everything else as well.

- **Q:** A Braisa learns from the pasuk of “mimoshvoseichem tavi’u lechem tenufah” to make a hekesh from the Shte Halechem to one of the types of breads brought with a Korbah Todah. There is then another hekesh which teaches to compare from these breads of the todah to the other breads of a todah. Now, this is a case of a partial hekesh. The Braisa makes sense according to **R’ Akiva**, but how would **R’ Yishmael** explain this Braisa? **A:** We learn the todah breads from the Shte Halechem from the extra word of “tavi’u”, not based on a hekesh.

HAPESACH EINO NECHAL

- **Q:** Who is the Tanna who holds that a Pesach may only be eaten until chatzos? **R’ Yosef** said, it is **R’ Elazar ben Azarya**, as can be seen in a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R’ Elazar ben Azarya** says, the pasuk regarding Korbah Pesach says “balayla hazeh” and the pasuk regarding makas bechoros says “balayla hazeh”. Just like makas bechoros was done at chatzos, so too the Korbah Pesach must be eaten by chatzos. **R’ Akiva** says, another pasuk teaches that it can be eaten until the time of “chipazon” (the time the Yidden were rushed out of Mitzrayim), which is the morning. The pasuk of “balayla hazeh” teaches that the Pesach must be eaten at night, and not by day. We see from this Braisa that **R’ Elazar ben Azarya** holds that it becomes nossar at chatzos.
 - **Q:** **Abaye** asked, maybe the Mishna is not following **R’ Elazar** and limits it to chatzos as a gezeira D’Rabanan? **A:** The use of the word “elah” in the Mishna shows that the Mishna is comparing the prohibition of eating after chatzos to the other prohibitions of eating the Pesach mentioned in the Mishna. Just as those other ones are certainly D’Oraisa, this one is as well.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK EIZEHU MEKOMAN!!!