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

Zevachim Daf Ayin Vuv

MISHNA

- If an asham became mixed up with a shelamim, **R' Shimon** says both of them should be shechted in the north and should be eaten according to the chumra of each of them. The **Chachomim** said to him, he would be increasing the chance that a korbon will be left over as passul (by shortening the allowable time for eating the shelamim) and that is not allowed.
- If pieces of meat of one korbon became mixed with pieces of meat of another korbon, whether it was kodshei kodashim and kodashim kalim, or whether it was things that can be eaten for one day and a night with things that can be eaten for two days and a night, they should be eaten according to the chumra of each of them.

GEMARA

- A Braisa was taught in front of **Rav** that said, one may not use money of shmitta produce to buy terumah, because that limits the eating of the terumah (to the time limit allowed for eating shmitta produce).
    - The **Rabanan** said to **Rabbah**, this Braisa cannot follow **R' Shimon**, because he is not concerned with increasing the chance that a korbon will be left over as passul, and would therefore have no problem with limiting the time for the terumah to be eaten. **Rabbah** said, the Braisa may follow **R' Shimon**. **R' Shimon** is only not concerned when it was already mixed – b'dieved, but would not allow one to go ahead and do something that would limit the ability to eat it – l'chatchila.
        - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Mishna says that **R' Shimon** allows the Kohanim to spice the meat of korbanos even with spices of terumah. Now, that limits the allowable time to eat this terumah and shows that **R' Shimon** even allows this to be done l'chatchila!? **A: Rava** said, you can't bring a proof from this case, because terumah of spices is only D'Rabanan.
        - **Q:** A Mishna says that a Kohen may not purchase terumah with money of maaser sheini, but **R' Shimon** allows it. We see that **R' Shimon** allows this l'chatchila even though it limits the eating of the terumah (it now may only be eaten in Yerushalayim)!? To this, **Rava** remained quiet.
        - **R' Yosef** asked **Abaye**, why didn't you ask from another Mishna which says that one may not cook vegetables of shmitta with oil of terumah so that the terumah not risk becoming passul (along with the shmitta), but **R' Shimon** allows it. We see from here that **R' Shimon** allows this even l'chatchila! **Abaye** said, the oil discussed in the Mishna is vegetable oil, and the terumah is therefore only D'Rabanan. The same way he dismissed my proof from the spices of terumah, by saying the terumah is only D'Rabanan, he would have said the same thing on this Mishna. **R' Yosef** said, if the Mishna was discussing terumah D'Rabanan, it would have given the example of terumah of vegetables and oil of shmitta. The fact that it referenced oil of terumah means it was referring to a D'Oraisa! **Abaye** said, had I asked from this Mishna he would have answered the same way he answered when I asked from our Mishna – that the case is where it was already mixed, a case of b'dieved.
            - **Q:** If it was already mixed, why would the **Rabanan** say it may not be cooked? **A:** It is just like our Mishna, where the shelamim and asham were already mixed and still the **Rabanan** say it is assur so as not to cause the asham to become passul quicker. They would hold the same way in this case with the oil of terumah.

        - **Q:** They are machmir in the Mishna because there is a remedy – to allow the animals to graze, get a mum, and buy new korbanos. In the case of the oil there is no remedy. It is more similar to the later case of the Mishna, where pieces of meat of one korbon became mixed with pieces of meat of another korbon, where there is also no remedy, which is why the meat may be eaten within the bounds of the chumros of the two korbanos. Rather, the case of the terumah oil must be where it was not yet mixed, and still **R' Shimon** allows them to be cooked together although it limits the eating of the terumah!? **A: Ravina** said, this case is not like the case of the mixed pieces of meat. In the case of the meat there is absolutely no remedy. In the case of the oil there is a remedy – to squeeze out the oil from the vegetables, and that is why the **Rabanan** don't allow cooking them together.
            - **R' Yosef** says squeezing is not a remedy. If it is squeezed very hard it will cause the vegetables to be ruined. If it is not squeezed very hard it will still leave oil mixed in with the vegetables of shmitta.
- **Q: Abaye** tried to refute **Rabbah** again from another Braisa. The Braisa says that if a person is a safek metzora, **R' Shimon** says he brings a korbon and a log of oil on the 8th day and says, if he is truly a metzora it should be an asham, and if he is not it should be a shelamim. This korbon is then eaten for one day and a night like an asham. We see that **R' Shimon** is not concerned with limiting the allowable time for eating a korbon!? **A:** It may be that he allows that only because this remedies the person from his classification as a metzora, but otherwise would not allow that to be done.
    - **Q:** This process works for the korbon (if it is not an asham it becomes a shelamim), but what is done with the log of oil (if he is truly not a metzora how can it be brought)? **A:** He says, if the oil is not needed, it should be considered as a nedavah.
        - **Q:** If he is not a metzora, there would need to be a kometz taken from the oil and offered on the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** The Kohen does the kemitza.
        - **Q:** If he is a metzora there must be 7 applications with the oil!? **A:** The Kohen does the 7 applications.
        - **Q:** After the kemitza there is less than a full log of oil, so how can the applications then be done if there is not a full log of oil? **A:** After taking the kemitza they bring a little oil and add it to the oil, to complete the log. We find a Mishna that allows this to be done.
        - **Q:** If he is not truly a metzora the kemitza must be burned on the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** The Kohen burns it on the Mizbe'ach.
        - **Q:** If it is burned after the 7 applications are done, it would be a kemitza on which the leftovers are no longer complete, and we don't burn such a kemitza!? If it is burned before the 7 applications it may not be burned, because once part is burned on the Mizbe'ach we are no longer allowed to offer other parts!? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of R' Shimon ben Pazzi** said, the Kohen says, if the person is a metzora the sprinkling is done for him. If he is not, the sprinkling is being offered as fuel for the fire of the Mizbe'ach. We find that **R' Eliezer** of a Braisa allows this.
        - **Q:** If he is truly not a metzora, then the amount of oil that is added after the kemitza is taken, has never had a kemitza taken from it, and should therefore be assur!? **A:** He redeems that oil and removes its kedusha.

- **Q:** Where does he redeem it? If he redeems it in the Azarah, he has brought chullin into the Azarah, and if he does it outside, he has taken kodashim outside the Azarah!? **A:** He does it inside, and since it becomes chullin on its own when it is already inside the Azarah, it is not a problem.
- **Q: R' Shimon** said that one may not make a nedavah of oil!? **A:** It may be that he allows that only because this remedies the person from his classification as a metzora, but otherwise would not allow that to be done.
- **R' Rechumi in the name of R' Huna bar Tachlifa** said in front of **Ravina**, why doesn't the person say that the asham should be an asham taluy? It must be that the Tanna who argues on **R' Eliezer** is **R' Shimon**, who holds that one may not make a nedavah of an asham taluy. **Ravina** said, the animal brought for an asham is different than the animal brought for an asham taluy, and therefore this cannot be done.