



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

Zevachim Daf Samach Vuv

PEREK CHATAS HA'OF -- PEREK SHEVI'I

MISHNA

- A bird chatas which was offered below the red line, with the procedure of a chatas, for the sake of a chatas, is valid.
 - If it was offered with the procedure of a chatas but for the sake of an olah, or with the procedure of an olah but for the sake of a chatas, or with the procedure of an olah for the sake of an olah, the korbon is passul.
 - If it was offered above the red line with any of the above procedures (even that of a chatas), it is passul.
- A bird olah that was offered above the red line, with the procedure of an olah, for the sake of an olah, is valid.
 - If it was offered with the procedure of an olah for the sake of a chatas, it is valid but does not fulfil the obligation of the owner.
 - If it was offered with the procedure of a chatas but for the sake of an olah, or with the procedure of a chatas for the sake of a chatas, the korbon is passul.
 - If it was offered below the red line with any of the above procedures (even that of an olah), it is passul.

GEMARA

- **Q:** When the Mishna refers to the bird chatas that was offered using the procedure of a bird olah but for the sake of a chatas, which procedure is it referring to? If it is referring to the Kohen having done the melika like an olah (he separated the head from the body), then we would have to say that our Mishna (that says it would be passul) does not follow the view of **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon**, who says that a bird chatas may be separated!? **A:** We have already said that the last Mishna does not follow his view, so it would not be difficult to say that this Mishna also does not follow his view.
 - The Gemara said, we can say that the Mishna does follow his view, and rather, when it refers to the procedure of an olah, it is referring to the sprinkling of the blood (he only squeezed out the blood, like an olah, and didn't first sprinkle the blood as is supposed to be done for a chatas). It makes sense to say that this is what is referred to, based on the end of the Mishna. The Mishna says, if it was offered above the red line with any of the above procedures (even that of a chatas), it is passul. Now, what procedure was done above the red line? It can't be referring to the melika, because we have learned that the melika can be done anywhere. Rather, it is referring to where the sprinkling was done above the line. So too, in the earlier case it is referring to the procedure of sprinkling.
 - The Gemara says, this is no proof. It may be that the earlier case is referring to melika and the later case is referring to the sprinkling.

OLAS HA'OF...

- **Q:** When the Mishna refers to the bird olah that was offered using the procedure of a bird chatas, which procedure is it referring to? It can't be referring to the Kohen having done the melika like an chatas (he didn't separate the head from the body), because the next Mishna says that in all the cases of our Mishna, even though the korbon may be passul, the melika accomplishes to prevent tumah of neveila from coming upon the person who swallows it, but there is still the issur of me'ilah. **R' Yehoshua** later in the Mishna says that a bird olah offered as a chatas with the melika of a chatas, becomes a chatas and would therefore not have the issur of me'ilah on its meat. Now, if our Mishna means that the melika of a chatas was done to the

olah, and it is on that case that the anonymous beginning of the next Mishna says that there is me'ilah, we would be forced to say that the anonymous Mishna does not follow the view of **R' Yehoshua**! We also can't say that it refers to where the sprinkling of a chatas was done to the olah (the blood was sprinkled and was not squeezed out as is required for an olah). The next part of the next Mishna says, if a bird olah was offered below the line with the procedure of a chatas for the sake of a chatas, **R' Eliezer** says it is still subject to me'ilah and **R' Yehoshua** says it is not. Now, that can't be talking about where only the sprinkling procedure of a chatas was done, because **R' Yehoshua** only says there is no me'ila when the *melika* of a chatas was done to the olah! If only the blood procedure was changed he would not say that there is no me'ila! If you will say that this last section is referring to a change to the melika, then we would be forced to say that the first part of our Mishna refers to melika, the second part of our Mishna (regarding the olah bird) refers to the blood procedure, and the next part (the next Mishna) again refers to melika! **A:** Yes, we must say that the first and last sections refer to melika, and the middle section (the last section of our Mishna) refers to the blood procedure.

MISHNA

- All the bird korbanos listed in the Mishna above do not create tumas neveila when swallowed, but they are subject to me'ilah. The exception is the case of the bird chatas that was offered below the line, with the procedure of a chatas, for the sake of a chatas (that is a valid chatas and would therefore not be subject to me'ilah).
- If an olah bird was offered below the line with the procedure of a chatas for the sake of a chatas, **R' Eliezer** says it would be subject to me'ilah and **R' Yehoshua** says it is not.
 - **R' Eliezer** said, if a chatas which has been offered for its own sake is not subject to me'ilah, and yet, when he offers it for the sake of another korban it is subject to me'ilah, then an olah which is subject to me'ilah when offered for its own sake, should surely be subject to me'ilah when it is offered for the sake of another korban!? **R' Yehoshua** responded, this is not a proof. When a chatas is brought for the sake of an olah it is subject to me'ilah because it is being offered for the sake of something (an olah) that is subject to me'ilah! However, when an olah is brought for the sake of a chatas it is being offered for the sake of something (a chatas) that is not subject to me'ilah (when offered properly)!
 - **R' Eliezer** said, we can bring a proof from the case of kodshei kodashim that were shechted in the south of the Azarah for the sake of kodshei kalim, which is a case in which it was offered for the sake of something that is not subject to me'ilah, and yet the korban continues to be subject to me'ilah! So too, when an olah is offered for the sake of a chatas, the olah too can remain subject to me'ilah (even though a chatas is not subject to me'ilah). **R' Yehoshua** responded, the case of kodshei kodashim being shechted for the sake of kodshei kalim is very different, because kodshei kalim are partly subject to me'ilah and partly not (when they are offered properly). Therefore, this cannot be compared to the case of an olah offered for the sake of a chatas, which (the chatas) is something that is entirely not subject to me'ilah (when offered properly).