



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

Zevachim Daf Tzaddik Aleph

- The Gemara is trying to answer the question of which takes precedence – something that is tadir or something that is more kadosh.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from a Braisa which says that when reciting kiddush, the bracha on the wine comes before the bracha made for Shabbos, because the bracha on wine is more tadir. Now, this is so even though the bracha of Shabbos is more kadosh, since it is made in honor of Shabbos! **A:** Even the bracha made on wine, when made on Shabbos, has a higher level of kedusha because of the Shabbos. Therefore, they are considered to be on the same level of kedusha and we therefore give precedence to the tadir.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from the ruling of **R' Yochanan** that says that if it is time to daven mincha and a person has not yet davened mussaf, he should first daven mincha and then mussaf, because mincha is more tadir. Now, this is so even though the mussaf is more kadosh, since it is davened in honor of Shabbos! **A:** Even the tefilla of mincha, when davened on Shabbos, has a higher level of kedusha because of the Shabbos. Therefore, they are considered to be on the same level of kedusha and we therefore give precedence to the tadir.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from our Mishna. The Mishna said, between a shelamim of yesterday and a chatas or asham of today, the shelamim of yesterday comes first. This implies that if the shelamim was also of today, the chatas or asham would come first. This is so even though a shelamim is more tadir (there are more shelamim offered than chatas or ashamos)! We see that kedusha is more important than tadir! **A: Rava** said, this is not what we mean by tadir. When we discuss tadir we are referring to something that is obligated to be brought with more frequency than something else. A shelamim is brought more often, but not as an obligation. This would be referred to as “matzuy”. With regard to matzuy we know that kedusha would come first. Our question is regarding something that is tadir.
 - **Q: R' Huna bar Yehuda** asked **Rava**, a Braisa refers to milah as tadir, even though it is not something that is done at regular intervals, and is just more commonly done!? We see that even this is considered to be tadir and not matzuy!? **A:** The Braisa refers to milah as tadir because we are commanded regarding it so many times. We can also answer that when milah is compared to Korbon Pesach (which is the subject of the Braisa) it is considered to be tadir.
- **Q:** What would be if we have something that is tadir and something that is not, and the thing that is not tadir was shechted first? Would we say that since it was already shechted we should offer it first, or do we say that we give the blood to someone to stir it, go ahead and shecht and offer the tadir, and then come back and offer the one that is not tadir? **A: R' Huna of Sura** said, our Mishna says, if there is a shelamim of yesterday and a chatas or asham of today, the shelamim of yesterday comes first. Presumably, the case is where the shelamim was shechted first (although we should have shechted the chatas or asham first), and because it waited since yesterday to be shechted, once it was, we go ahead and offer it before we even shecht the chatas or asham. Now, in a similar case, but where the shelamim was of today – which would be where the shelamim was shechted first even though it should not have been done – the Mishna implies that we would offer the chatas or asham first. We see that we would allow the blood of the less kadosh shelamim to be stirred while we shecht and offer the chatas or asham!
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. The Mishna may be referring to a case where the shelamim was shechted first, but the chatas or asham was then shechted as well. We now have the blood of each in front of us. It is in that case that we say that if the

shelamim was from yesterday we would offer it first, which would imply that if the shelamim was from today we would not offer it first. However, in a case where the shelamim was shechted but the chatas or asham was still alive, we still have the question whether we would offer the shelamim blood or would wait, shecht the chatas or asham, offer the chatas or asham, and then come back and offer the shelamim.

- **Q:** Maybe we can answer from a Braisa which says that when reciting kiddush, the bracha on the wine comes before the bracha made for Shabbos, because the bracha on wine is more tadir. Now, the bracha for the Shabbos is obligated to be made before the wine is even brought to the table. This is similar to a case in which a less tadir was shechted before a tadir, and yet the Braisa says that we give precedence to the more tadir! **A:** This is different. Since the wine is there when he is ready to make the bracha on the Shabbos, it is considered to be a case of where both are already “shechted”.
- **Q:** Maybe we can answer from the ruling of **R’ Yochanan** that says that if it is time to daven mincha and a person has not yet davened mussaf, he should first daven mincha and then mussaf, because mincha is more tadir. This is so even though the time for davening mussaf arrived first. Yet, we say that the tadir comes and takes precedence! **A:** Here too, once the time for mincha has arrived it is considered to be a case of where both are already “shechted”.
- **Q: R’ Acha the son of R’ Ashi** said to **Ravina**, maybe we can answer from a Mishna which says that if the Pesach was shechted before the afternoon Tamid, it is valid, but the blood of the Pesach should be stirred until the Tamid is shechted and offered, and then the blood of the Pesach is offered. This seems to answer our question! **A:** The case of the Mishna may be where he went ahead and shechted the Tamid, and therefore has the blood of the Pesach and of the Tamid waiting to be offered. It is only in that case where the blood of the Pesach would wait until the blood of the Tamid was offered. In fact, **R’ Acha Sabba** showed how the words of the Mishna suggest that that is the case that the Mishna is talking about.

UVIKULAN KOHANIM RASHA’IN...

- This is based on the pasuk of “I’ mashcha”, which teaches that the Kohanim are given the meat for greatness, to be eaten like kings eat their meat (in the tastiest of ways).

MISHNA

- **R’ Shimon** said, if you see oil being given out to the Kohanim in the Azarah, you don’t have to ask what this oil is – it must either be the leftover of the “rekikei menachos” of Yisraelim or the leftover of the log of oil of a metzora. If you see oil being put onto the fire of the Mizbe’ach, you don’t have to ask what this oil is – it must be the leftover of the “rekikei menachos” of Kohanim, or the leftover of the mincha of the Kohen Gadol. It cannot be a nedavah of oil, because one may not give a nedavah of oil as a korbon. **R’ Tarfon** says, one may donate oil as a korbon.

GEMARA

- **Shmuel** said, according to **R’ Tarfon**, when someone makes a nedavah of oil as a korbon the Kohen takes a kometz for the Mizbe’ach, and the rest is eaten. This is based on the pasuk of “korbon mincha” (the word “korbon” is extra) which teaches that one may give a nedavah of oil as a korbon, and that it is treated like a mincha – a kometz is removed for the Mizbe’ach and the remainder is eaten by the Kohanim.
 - **R’ Zeira** said, we can prove this from our Mishna as well. The Mishna said that **R’ Shimon** said that if you see oil being given out to the Kohanim in the Azarah, you don’t have to ask what this oil is – it must either be the leftover of the “rekikei menachos” of Yisraelim or the leftover of the log of oil of a metzora....and you don’t have think that it may be a nedavah, because one may not give oil as a nedavah for a korbon. Now, this suggests that according to the view that one may give a nedavah of oil, it would be given out to the Kohanim. **Abaye** said to **R’ Zeira**, the next part of the Mishna said, if you see oil being put onto the fire of the Mizbe’ach, you don’t have to ask what this oil is – it must be the leftover of the “rekikei menachos” of Kohanim, or the leftover of the mincha of the Kohen Gadol. It cannot be a nedavah of oil, because one may not give a nedavah of oil as a korbon. This suggests that according to the view that one may give a nedavah of oil, the offering would be put onto the fire in its entirety!

- **Q:** A Braisa says that according to **R' Akiva** who says that one may make a nedavah of wine as a korban, the wine is poured into the bowls (not onto the fire like **Shmuel** said)!? Also, another Braisa says that the wine of nesachim must be poured into the bowls and not onto the fire so as not to extinguish the fire!? **A:** The view that it is poured into the bows follows **R' Yehuda** (who says that one may not do something that will be assur, even if he is doing it unintentionally), whereas **Shmuel** follows the view of **R' Shimon** (who says that if it is done unintentionally it is mutar).
 - **Q:** Can we say that **Shmuel** agrees with **R' Shimon**? We see that **Shmuel** does not agree with **R' Shimon**, in a case where there is burning wood in the reshus harabim, **Shmuel** says one may not put out the flame, although there is a sakana and it is a “melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufa”, because he would thereby be oiver an issur D'Oraisa?! **A:** He agrees with **R' Shimon** that a “davar she'eino meskaven” is mutar. He disagrees with **R' Shimon** with regard to a “melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufa”.
- **R' Huna** said, if nesachim became tamei, we make a separate fire for them in the Azarah and burn them there (rather than take them out of the Azarah to be burned). This is based on the pasuk of “bakodesh...ba'aish tisaref”.
 - A Braisa says this as well, and **Shmuel** held like this as well.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL HATADIR