



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

Zevachim Daf Samach Zayin

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R' Eliezer** said to **R' Yehoshua**, we can prove this from the case of an asham that was shechted in the north (its proper place) for the sake of a shelamim, which although is offered not for its sake, is still subject to me'ilah. The same would be for an olah bird offered not for its sake – it too will remain subject to me'ilah! **R' Yehoshua** responded, the case of the asham is different, for although it was offered not for its sake, it was offered in its proper place. This is different than the case of the olah bird, which was offered not for its sake and was offered not in its proper location. **R' Eliezer** said, we can prove this from the case of an asham that was shechted in the south (not its proper place) for the sake of a shelamim, which although is offered not for its sake and not in its proper place, is still subject to me'ilah. The same would be for an olah bird offered not for its sake and not in its proper place – it too will remain subject to me'ilah! **R' Yehoshua** responded, the case of the asham is different, for although it was offered not for its sake and not in its proper place, it was offered with its proper procedure. This is different than the case of the olah bird, which was offered not for its sake and was offered not in its proper location and was offered not with its proper procedure. **R' Eliezer** then remained silent.
 - **Rava** asked, why did he remain silent? He should have responded with the case of an asham that was shechted in the south for the sake of a shelamim and for the sake of a different owner. Although it is offered not for its sake, not in the proper place, and not with the proper procedure, it is still subject to me'ilah. From the fact that he did not respond with this it must be that he realized the reason of **R' Yehoshua**, and realized that it could not be refuted with this case. It is as **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, that **R' Yehoshua** would say that a bird olah that was offered below the line, with the procedure of a chatas, for the sake of a chatas, as soon as he does melika to one siman, it becomes a bird chatas.
 - **Q:** If so, we should also say that a bird chatas that was offered above the line, with the olah procedure and for the sake of an olah, as soon as melika is done on one siman it should become a bird olah!? You can't say that it will in fact become an olah, because **R' Yochanan in the name of R' Bina'ah** said that the version of the Mishna as we have it is proper, which presumably means to say that **R' Yehoshua** wouldn't argue in the case of the chatas offered above the line! **A:** **R' Bina'ah** may have meant that this is the version that should be applied to the *entire* Mishna, meaning that although he only argues regarding the olah offered below, it should be understood as if he is also arguing regarding a chatas offered above. **A2:** **R' Ashi** said, **R' Yehoshua** only holds that way regarding an olah bird that was offered below the line as a chatas for the sake of a chatas. The reason is that the melika of a chatas is on one siman whereas the melika of an olah is on two simanim. Now, since an olah is not brought below the line, as soon as the melika cuts through the first siman it becomes a chatas. However, with regard to a bird chatas that is done above and offered as an olah for the sake of an olah, since we have learned that melika can be done in any place, as soon as he cuts through the first siman it becomes a chatas, and since he is doing it not for the sake of the chatas, it becomes passul. By then cutting through the second siman it would not transform it to an olah since it already has the status of a passul chatas.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, if the olah bird of one woman and the chatas bird of another woman were given to a Kohen and he mistakenly offered them both above the

line as olos, one is valid and one is not. If he offered them both below the line as chata'os, one is valid and one is not. If one was offered above as an olah and one was offered below as a chatas they are both passul, because we say that the chatas may have been offered above and the olah below. Now, according to **R' Ada bar Ahava's** explanation of **R' Yehoshua**, in this last case, even if the olah was offered below we should say that it becomes a valid chatas!? **A: R' Yehoshua** only said this when one person was involved, not when we are dealing with the korbanos of two different people.

- **Q:** A Mishna continues on the above case and says, if in addition, these two women gave the Kohen a pair of unspecified birds to be offered for them and another pair designating one as a chatas and one as an olah, without specifying which is for which woman, and the Kohen then went and offered all the birds as olos above the line, half are valid. If he offered all below the line as chata'os, half are valid. If he offered half above the line and half below, only the unspecified pair is valid, and it is divided between the two women. Now, why wouldn't at least one of the specified pair be valid? Even if it was the olah that was offered below the line, it should become a valid chatas!? You can't answer that this Mishna does not follow **R' Yehoshua**, because the Mishna continues giving variations of cases which would require a woman who brought bird korbanos, which were then mixed up, to have to bring a number of additional birds in order to fulfil her obligation – with the climax of the Mishna requiring her to bring 7, and according to **Ben Azzai** 8, additional birds. The Mishna then ends with a statement of **R' Yehoshua** saying that “this is what people mean when they say that a live ram has one sound and a dead one has 7 sounds”. This shows that the Mishna is following the view of **R' Yehoshua**. If so, the Mishna contradicts **R' Yehoshua** as explained by **R' Ada bar Ahava**!? **A: R' Yehoshua** (as explained by **R' Ada bar Ahava**) only meant that the olah becomes a chatas with regard to it not being subject to me'ilah. He never meant that it becomes a chatas to the extent of it fulfilling the person's chatas obligation.