



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

Zevachim Daf Pey Tes

PEREK KOL HATADIR -- PEREK ASIRI

MISHNA

- Anything that is more tadir (frequent) than another thing, takes precedence over that other thing.
 - The Tamid comes before the Mussaf, the Mussaf of Shabbos comes before the Mussaf of Rosh Chodesh, the Mussaf of Rosh Chodesh comes before the Mussaf of Rosh Hahshana. This is based on the pasuk of "milvad olas haboker asher l'olas hatamid taasus eileh".

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that a tadir takes precedence?
 - **Q:** The Mishna says it is based on the pasuk!? **A:** That explains why the tamid takes precedence, because it is brought every day. How do we know that this concept even applies when deciding between which mussaf to bring first (things that are not brought every day)?
 - **A: R' Illa'ah** said, the pasuk says "ka'eileh taasus layom shivas yamim", which teaches that "these" (the mussaf of each day of Pesach) is like "those" (the tamid and the mussaf of the first day, where the tadir took precedence).
 - **Q:** This pasuk is needed to teach that each day of Pesach the mussaf is the same!? **A:** The pasuk could have said "eileh".
 - **Q:** If it didn't say "ka'eileh" we would think that these 7 lambs should be divided among the seven days (rather than 7 lambs to be brought each day)!? **A:** We would not say that, because the pasuk says "layom".
 - **Q:** We would say that "eileh layom" teaches that this amount is brought on the first day, and on the remaining days we would not know how many are brought!? **A:** The pasuk says "taasus", which teaches that all days are to be the same.
 - **A: Abaye** said, the pasuk says "milvad olas haboker asher l'olas hatamid". This extra phrase of "olas hatamid" teaches that something that is more frequent takes precedence.

MISHNA

- Anything that is more kadosh than another thing takes precedence over that other thing.
 - The applying of chatas blood comes before the applying of olah blood, because the chatas brings a kapparah.
 - The burning of the olah limbs comes before the burning of the chatas eimurim, because an olah is burned in its entirety on the Mizbe'ach.
 - A chatas comes before an asham, because its blood is offered on all 4 corners and on the base.
 - An asham comes before a todah and a nazir's ram, because it is kodshei kodashim.
 - A todah and nazir's ram come before a shelamim, because they are only eaten for one day and require that bread be brought with them.
 - A shelamim comes before a bechor, because its blood is applied to all 4 corners, it requires semicha, nesachim, and tenufas chazeh v'shok.
 - A bechor comes before a korbon maaser, because it is kadosh from birth and is eaten only by Kohanim.

- A korbon maaser comes before bird korbanos, because it requires shechita and 2 parts – its blood and its eimurim – are considered kodshei kodashim.
- Bird korbanos come before menachos, because they are korbanos that have blood.
- A chatas mincha comes before a minchas nedavah, because it is brought to bring kapparah for an aveira.
- A bird chatas comes before a bird olah with regard to its being offered and also with regard to its becoming hekdesh.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that a chatas comes before an olah for zrika, but an olah comes first for burning? **A:** A Braisa says, one pasuk says “upar sheini ben bakar tikach l’chatas”, which suggests that the chatas is to be second to the olah. Another pasuk says “va’assei es ha’echad chatas v’es ha’echad olah”, which suggests that the chatas takes precedence. This teaches that with regard to offering of blood the chatas takes precedence, because it brings a kapparah, and with regard to burning the limbs the olah comes first.
 - **Q:** It is only the first blood application of the chatas that brings the kapparah, so only that very first application should take precedence!? **A: Ravina** said, this pasuk is referring to the chatas brought by the Levi’im when they were installed into service. This chatas was actually not brought for kapparah. Yet, the pasuk teaches that since it is a chatas it takes precedence. We see that even if the application is not bringing a kapparah, it should still take precedence over an olah. **A2:** In EY they said, since he started with the applications of a chatas, he finishes them before moving on to the olah.
- **Q:** Between the zrika of a chatas and the burning of the limbs of an olah, which takes precedence? Is it the chatas, because it brings kapparah or is it the olah, because it is burned in its entirety? **A:** The Mishna said “the blood of a chatas comes before the blood of an olah”. This suggests that it only comes before the *blood* of an olah, and not before the *limbs* of an olah.
 - **Q:** The Mishna then says that the “limbs of an olah take precedence over the eimurim of a chatas”. This suggests that the limbs of an olah only take precedence over the *eimurim* of a chatas, and not over the *blood* of a chatas!? Rather, no proof can be brought from the Mishna.
- **Q:** Between the blood of an olah and the burning of the eimurim of a chatas, which takes precedence? **A:** The Mishna said “the blood of a chatas comes before the blood of an olah”. This suggests that it is only the *blood* of a chatas that comes before the blood of an olah, and not the *eimurim* of a chatas.
 - **Q:** The Mishna then says that the “limbs of an olah take precedence over the eimurim of a chatas”. This suggests that it is only the *limbs* of an olah that take precedence over the *eimurim* of a chatas, and not the *blood* of an olah!? Rather, no proof can be brought from the Mishna.
- **Q:** Between the blood of an olah and the blood of an asham (which brings kapparah), which takes precedence? **A:** The Mishna said “the blood of a chatas comes before the blood of an olah”. This suggests that the blood of an asham would not come before the blood of an olah.
 - This is not a valid proof. It may be that the blood of an asham comes first. The reason the Mishna chose to speak of a chatas is that regarding the burning of an olah, had we said that it comes before an asham, we would say that it only comes before an asham, but not before a chatas. That is why the Mishna spoke of the chatas, but maybe not to say that the blood of an olah would come before the blood of an asham.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from this part of the Mishna. The Mishna said, “a chatas comes before an asham”. This suggests that it is only a chatas that comes before an asham, but an olah would not come before an asham, and presumably we are discussing the zrika! **A:** The Mishna is referring to the offering of the eimurim of the chatas versus the offering of the eimurim of the asham. It must be that that is what is being discussed, because the Mishna says “because the blood of the chatas...” instead of saying “because it...”. SHEMA MINAH.

CHATAS KODEMES...

- **Q:** An asham should come before a chatas, because it has a minimum required value!? **A:** The fact that chatas blood is placed on all 4 corners is a more important reason.

ASHAM KODEM L'TODAH...

- **Q:** The todah and nazir's ram should come before an asham, because they require the bringing of breads!? **A:** The fact that the asham is kodshei kodashim is a more important reason.

TODAH V'EIL NAZIR...

- **Q:** A shelamim should come first because it can be brought from the tzibbur as well (a todah and nazir's ram cannot)!? **A:** The fact that they are eaten for only one day is a more important reason.
- **Q:** Between a todah and a nazir's ram, which one comes first? Does a todah come first because it requires the bringing of 4 different types of breads, or does the nazir's ram come first because it has a shelamim brought along with it? **A:** A Braisa clearly says that the todah comes first because it requires the bringing of 4 different types of breads.

HASHELAMIM KODMIN L'BECHOR...

- **Q:** A bechor should come first, because it is born with its kedusha and only eaten by Kohanim!? **A:** The fact that the shelamim has all of its additional mitzvos associated with it, that makes it more important and therefore it comes first.

HABECHOR KODEM...

- **Q:** A korbon maaser should come first because it makes kadosh the animal counted before it and after it (when there was an error in the counting)!? **A:** The fact that bechor is kadosh from when it is born is more important.

MAASER KODEM L'OFOS...

- **Q:** The bird korbanos should come first because they are kodshei kodashim!? **A:** The fact that the maaser is an animal that gets shechita is more important.
- **Ravina bar Shila** said, the eimurim of kodshei kalim that left the Azarah before the zrika, become passul. We can see this from our Mishna, which says that maaser comes before bird korbanos, because it is an animal that gets shechita and its blood and eimurim are kodshei kodashim. Now, a bird has blood as well!? Rather, the reason the Mishna mentions blood and eimurim together is to teach that just as we are discussing blood before the zrika so too we are discussing eimurim before the zrika, and the Mishna refers to it as kodshei kodashim. This teaches that just as the blood becomes passul if it leaves the Azarah, the eimurim would as well.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can prove this from another place as well. We have learned with regard to meat of kodshei kalim that left the Azarah before the zrika – **R' Yochanan** says the meat is valid since it will anyway be allowed to leave after the zrika, and **Reish Lakish** says it is passul because it is not yet the time for it to leave. Now, they only seem to argue regarding the meat, but don't seem to argue regarding the eimurim. Presumably, they would both agree that the eimurim would be passul in that case! **A:** It may be that they argue regarding the eimurim as well. The reason they only discuss the meat is to teach the extent of **Reish Lakish** who says that the meat is passul even though they will eventually be allowed to leave the Azarah.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that the ruling of **Ravina bar Shila** is the subject of a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says, with regard to eimurim of kodshei kalim that left the Azarah before zrika, **R' Eliezer** says they are not subject to me'ilah even after the zrika, and one would not be chayuv on them for piggul, nossar, or tamei. **R' Akiva** says they are subject to me'ilah, and one would be chayuv for piggul, nossar and tamei. Presumably, the basis for the machlokes is a case where the eimurim were brought back in after having been taken out of the Azarah, and when they were back in the zrika was done. **R' Eliezer** says they became passul when they left and **R' Akiva** holds that they did not become passul! **A:** **R' Pappa** said, it may be that if the eimurim are brought back inside before the zrika all would agree that the zrika would be effective to make them subject to me'ilah, piggul, nossar, and tamei. The case that they argue is when they are outside during the time of the zrika. **R' Eliezer** holds that a zrika is not effective for something outside the Azarah and **R' Akiva** holds that it is.
 - **Q:** Regarding the Shte Halechem **R' Pappa** said that all would agree that if they are outside the Azarah during the zrika, the zrika would not be effective!? **A:** That is because the Shte Halechem is not part of the animal itself. However, regarding eimurim, which come from the same animal as the blood that is being offered, there is a machlokes whether the zrika is effective for the eimurim even while they are outside the Azarah.