



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Zevachim, Daf ק"ג – Daf ק"ד

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf ק"ג---104-----

- The Gemara mentioned a machlokes between **Rebbi and R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon**. The machlokes was in a Braisa. The Braisa says, **Rebbi** said, the zrika accomplishes for the skin of the korb'on on its own. When it is still attached to the meat, if the meat became passul even before or after the zrika, the skin gets the same status as the meat. **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** said, the zrika does not accomplish for the skin of the korb'on on its own. When the skin is still attached to the meat, if the meat becomes passul before the zrika the skins also become passul. If the meat becomes passul after the zrika, then as long as the meat was valid for at least a moment, the animal can be skinned and the skins go to the Kohanim.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that they argue in the same machlokes as exists between **R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua** in a Braisa. **R' Yehoshua** says that the pasuk of "v'sasisa olosecha habasar v'hadam" teaches that if the blood of an olah becomes passul its meat is not brought on the Mizbe'ach, and if the meat becomes passul its blood is not offered on the Mizbe'ach. **R' Eliezer** says, even if the meat becomes passul the blood is still offered, based on the pasuk of "v'dam zivachecha yishafeich". He says that the pasuk of "v'sasisa olosecha habasar v'hadam" teaches that just as the blood is thrown onto the Mizbe'ach, the meat is also thrown on – which teaches that there was a space between the ramp and the Mizbe'ach. Maybe we can say that **Rebbi** will hold like **R' Eliezer**, and that **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** holds like **R' Yehoshua**? **A:** All would agree that according to **R' Eliezer** the zrika would accomplish for the skins alone even if the meat is passul. The machlokes would be according to **R' Yehoshua**. **R' Elazar** would say that **R' Yehoshua** holds like him, but **Rebbi** would say that **R' Yehoshua** only holds that way regarding the meat, since it involves no loss to the Kohanim. However, regarding the skins, which would be a loss for the Kohanim, he would agree that the zrika would permit the skins. It would be no different than the case of where one did zrika where the meat was passul, in which case **R' Yehoshua** says that b'dieved it is a valid zrika.

AMAR R' CHANINA S'GAN HAKOHANIM...

- **Q:** Can it be that he never saw skins being burned? What about the korbanos that are brought inside the Heichal (the parim hanisrafim and se'irim hanisrafim) where are burned along with their skins!? **A:** He was referring to korbanos whose proper process is not to have the skins burned.
 - **Q:** What about a korb'on that became passul before the skinning and before the zrika, where the skins would certainly be burned? **A:** He was referring to skins that were no longer attached to the meat.
 - **Q:** What about a korb'on that became passul after the skinning but before the zrika, which according to **R' Elazar** would have to be burned? **A:** **R' Chanina** holds like **Rebbi** who says that the zrika would make those skins mutar. Or, even if he holds like **R' Elazar**, he would hold that the skinning was not done before the zrika.
 - **Q:** What about the case where the animal was found to be a treifa in its internal organs? **A:** He holds that the skins of such a korb'on would be mutar. In fact, the words of **R' Akiva** in the Mishna suggest this, because he says that from **R' Chanina** we can learn that if a bechor was skinned and then found to be a treifa, the Kohanim may benefit from the skins.
 - **Q:** If this is what **R' Chanina** meant, what is **R' Akiva** coming to add? **A:** He is teaching that the skins of a bechor don't become assur for the Kohen even if a bechor outside of the Beis Hamikdash – i.e. a bechor with a mum – is later found to be a treifa.
 - **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said that the halacha follows the view of **R' Akiva**, but even **R' Akiva** would agree that this is only so when an expert ruled that the bechor had a mum, but if it was not paskened on by an expert, it would not be mutar.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Gemara paskens like the **Chachomim** who argue on **R' Chanina**, who say that if the animal is found to have been a treifah that was in existence before the skinning, the skins must be burned.

MISHNA

- With regard to the “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim”, when they are being burned as they are supposed to be (not due to them having become passul), they are burned in the Beis Hadashen and they make tamei the clothing of the people who burn them. If they were burned not based on it being done as a valid process, they are burned at the “birah” and do not make the person’s clothing tamei.
- With regard to these korbanos when they are properly burned, they would carry them out on poles. When the people carrying in front have left the wall of the Azarah, but those in the back have not yet left, the clothing of the ones in the front become tamei, but not of those in the back until they leave the wall as well. Once they leave, the clothing of all the people are tamei. **R' Shimon** says the clothing only becomes tamei once the fire has caught onto most of the animal (and only for those people who are involved at that point in time). Once the meat has decomposed, the one who burns it then will not have his clothing become tamei.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is the “birah”? **A:** **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, there was a place on the Har Habayis called the “Birah”. **Reish Lakish** said, the Beis Hamikdash is referred to as “Birah”.
- **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** said, there were three places of ashes that were used: 1) there was a large place of ashes in the Azarah where they burned kodshei kodashim that became passul, the eimurim of kodshei kalim that became passul, and the “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim” that became passul before their zrika; 2) another place of ashes on the Har Habayis where they burned “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim” that became passul after their zrika; and 3) a place of ashes where they burned “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim” that were offered properly.
 - **Levi** taught a Braisa that said, there were three places of ashes that were used: 1) there was a large place of ashes in the Azarah where they burned kodshei kodashim that became passul, the eimurim of kodshei kalim that became passul, and the “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim” that became passul before or after their zrika; 2) another place of ashes on the Har Habayis where they burned “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim” that became passul after they left the Azarah; and 3) a place of ashes located outside of all 3 machanos (outside Yerushalayim) where they burned “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim” that were offered properly.
- **Q: R' Elazar** asked, is there a psul of linah for the “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim”? Do we say that linah is only a psul for korbanos that can be eaten, or do we say that it is a psul for these as well? **A: Rava** said, **Abaye** had this question and answered it from a Braisa that says that **R' Shimon and the Rabanan** agree that piggul intent will not effect these korbanos. Presumably, the same would be true for linah.
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof, because it may be that although piggul doesn’t make them passul, linah would.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from a Mishna. The Mishna says that after shechita of the “parim hanisrafim” they become susceptible to becoming passul with “linah”. Presumably, this refers to the meat being left overnight, and we can learn from this that they are subject to the psul of linah! **A:** It may be that the Mishna is referring to where the pieces that are offered on the Mizbe’ach (the eimurim) were left overnight, not the meat.
 - **Q:** The end of the Mishna clearly is discussing the meat, which would suggest that the earlier part is as well!? **A:** That is not necessarily true. It may very well be that the first part discusses the pieces to be offered on the Mizbe’ach and the later part discusses the meat.
 - **Q:** The Braisa taught by **Levi** referred to a psul after these korbanos left the Azarah. Presumably it is referring to the psul of linah! **A:** It can be referring to the psul of tumah or the psul of leaving the Azarah.
- **Q: R' Elazar** asked, is there a psul of yotzei (leaving the Azarah) for the “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim”? **R' Yirmiya bar Abba** explained, the question is according to the view that kodshei kodashim that

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

leave the Azarah before the zrika become passul. Maybe it is only there, since there is never an *obligation* to take them out of the Azarah. However, with regard to the korbanos that are burned, since they will be *obligated* to be removed from the Azarah, maybe they don't become passul if they are taken out early before the zrika. Or, maybe they would also become passul. **A:** The Braisa taught by **Levi** referred to a psul after these korbanos left the Azarah. Presumably it is referring to the psul of leaving the Azarah before the zrika.

○ This is not a valid proof. It can be referring to the psul of tumah or the psul of linah.

- **Q: R' Elazar** asked, what is the halacha if most of the animal of the “parim hanisrafim” and the “se'irim hanisrafim” has left the Azarah, but there is only a majority of the animal when we take into account the part of a limb that has left the Azarah, but with regard to that limb in particular, most of the limb is still inside the Azarah? Do we say that since most of that limb is inside we view the entire limb as being inside and therefore there is less than a majority of the animal that is outside, or do we say that since there is a majority of the animal as a whole that is outside, it is considered to be outside?
 - **Q:** It is certainly not a question, and we would certainly follow the majority of the animal, not the majority of the limb!? Rather, the question is where exactly half of the animal is outside, but in the half that is outside there is a majority of one of the limbs. Do we say that we view that entire limb as being outside and therefore a majority of the animal is outside, or not? **TEIKU.**
 - **Rabbah bar R' Huna** said the question is where there were 5 people carrying the animal out, and 3 have left the Azarah and two remain inside. Do we follow the majority of the people carrying it, and therefore the animal is considered to have left, or do we follow the majority of the animal itself? **TEIKU.**

-----Daf 77-----105-----

- **Q: R' Elazar** asked, what is the halacha if the parim hanisrafim were carried out of the Azarah and then brought back in? Do we say that since it was carried out, the people who carried it out become tamei, or do we say that since it was brought back in they are treated as if they never carried it out and remain tahor? **A: R' Abba bar Mamal** said, our Mishna said that they would carry the parim hanisrafim on poles, and if the people carrying in the front already left the Azarah, but the people in the back had not yet left, the people in the front are tamei and the people in the back are not. Now, if we say that once they leave they become tamei even if it was returned, the people who are in the back should be tamei here as well (since the animal itself has left). Rather, it must be that if the animal would go back into the Azarah they would become tahor again.
 - **Q: Ravina** asked, if someone never left the Azarah it cannot be that they become tamei, because they cannot be subject to the pasuk of “v'acharei chein yavo ehl hamachaneh” (since he never left)!? **A:** Rather, **R' Elazar's** question was whether after the animal was taken back into the Azarah, if different people who were outside the Azarah then used sticks to try and drag the animal back out, would they become tamei or not.
- A Braisa says, with regard to the parim hanisragfm, the parah adumah, and the goat that is sent to the Azazel, the one who sends the goat to the Azazel, the one who burns the parim and the parah adumah, and the ones who carry the parim out of the Azarah all become tamei and their clothing becomes tamei. The animals themselves would not make people or their clothing tamei through contact with the animals, but they would make tamei the foods and liquids that they touch. This is the view of **R' Meir**. The **Chachomim** say, the parim and the parah adumah make food and liquids tamei, but the goat would not, because it is sent when it is alive, and a live animal does not make foods and liquids tamei.
 - **Q:** The view of **R' Meir** is understandable, because he holds like **R' Yishmael**, who darshens a pasuk to teach that something that will become an av hatumah does not need to become muchshar in order to become tamei, and therefore, similarly since the goat will have the status of an av hatumah the goat can make food tamei even when alive (although typically a live animal cannot). However, what do the **Rabanan** hold? If they hold like **R' Yishmael**, the goat should also create tumah, and if they don't hold of him, the parim and the parah adumah should also not create tumah!? **A: R' Dimi** said, that in EY they said that even **R' Yishmael** would say that things that will not become an av hatumah would need to contract tumah from somewhere else in order to become tamei, whereas things that will become an av

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

hatumah do not. However, they would still need to be able to become tamei, and live animals cannot become tamei.

- **Q: R' Elazar** asked, with regard to the parim and se'irim hanisrafim, would they make food and drink tamei while they are still in the Azarah or not until they leave the Azarah? **A:** He then said, the fact that they didn't leave is like an act that was not done to them, and therefore they would not make things tamei inside the Azarah.
- **Q: R' Abba bar Shmuel** asked **R' Chiya bar Abba**, according to **R' Meir**, can a kezayis of a neveila of a kosher bird make tamei the food that it touched? Now, if it is laying on the ground, it definitely would not make it tamei. If it is in a person's mouth with the food, it definitely would make it tamei. The question is if the person is holding it in his hand to put it into his mouth. Do we say that there is an act that has not been done and it therefore will remain tahor, or not? **A:** He answered, this would not be considered as an act that needs to be done, and the food would therefore be tamei.
 - **Q:** An anonymous Mishna says, that the neveila of a kosher bird must be the size of a kebeitza in order to make food tamei. Presumably, this follows **R' Meir**, and therefore refutes the above!?!? **A:** The Mishna follows the view of the **Rabanan**.
 - **Q:** The earlier part of that Mishna follows the view of **R' Meir**, so this next part must follow him as well!?!? **A:** It may be that the first part follows **R' Meir** and the next part follows the **Rabanan**.
 - **Q:** The later part of the Mishna also follows **R' Meir**, so how can we say that the first and last part follow **R' Meir** but the middle follows the **Rabanan**!?!? **A:** We will have to say that the first and last part follow **R' Meir** but the middle follows the **Rabanan**.
 - **Q: R' Hamnuna** asked **R' Zeira**, according to **R' Meir**, does the neveila of a kosher bird make the food that it touches into a rishon or only a sheini? **A:** **R' Zeira** said, when something can make a person tamei by touching the person, it would make the food that it touches tamei, and if it can't make a person tamei by touching him, it would only make the food that it touches into a sheini. Since the bird cannot make a person tamei by touching him, the food would only become a sheini.
 - **Q: R' Zeira** asked **R' Ami bar Chiya** (or **R' Avin bar Kahana**), when the Braisa says that pieces of food that are connected with liquid are considered to be connected (to make the required minimum amount) for purposes of lenient tumah, but not with regard to severe tumah, if these connected pieces are neveila and food touched one of the pieces, would the food become tamei as a rishon or only as a sheini? **A:** He answered, when something can make a person tamei by touching the person, it would make the food that it touches tamei, and if it can't make a person tamei by touching him, it would only make the food that it touches into a sheini. Since these pieces cannot make a person tamei by touching him, the food would only become a sheini.

YATZU EILU V'EILU

- We learn this as taught in a Braisa. The Braisa says, regarding the Kohen Gadol's bull and the par helam the pasuk says that they are burned outside all 3 machanos. Regarding the Yom Kippur par and goat the pasuk says they are burned outside one machaneh (even though they are taken outside all 3 machanos). This teaches, that as soon as they leave the first machaneh the people carrying them and their clothing become tamei.
 - **Q:** How do we know that the Kohen Gadol's bull and the par helam are burned outside all 3 machanos?? **A:** The Torah says regarding those 2 korbanos, and regarding the removal of the ash from the Mizbe'ach, that they should all be done outside "the machaneh". There was no reason to state this regarding each one, because they can each be learned from the other. The Torah writes this 3 times to teach that the burning and placing must be done outside all 3 machanos.
 - **Q: R' Shimon** says that their clothing becomes tamei when most of the animal catches fire. If so, what does he learn from the pasuk of "yotzi ehl michutz lamachaneh v'sarfu"? **A:** He uses it as **R' Eliezer** uses it in a Braisa, to compare it to parah adumah, that is burned outside all 3 machanos, and is burned to the east of Yerushalayim. The same is with these animals. The **Rabanan** of the Braisa (who use the pasuk and don't have it available to teach this) will hold like the Braisa that says that these animals are burned to the north of Yerushalayim (they are chataos, which are always dealt with in the north).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “v’hasorep”, which teaches that only the clothing of the one who burns the animals becomes tamei, but not the clothing of the one who lights the fire, or the one who sets up the wood. The pasuk says “osam”, which teaches that the burning only makes the clothing tamei before the animals are reduced to ashes. **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Shimon** says, once the meat of the animals have decomposed, they no longer make the clothing tamei.
 - **Rava** says that the difference between the opinions would be where the animal was reduced to charcoal, but not yet to ashes.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK TVUL YOM!

-----Daf 17---106-----

PEREK HASHOCHET V’HAMAALAH -- PEREK SHLOSHA ASSAR

MISHNA

- If one shechts and offers a korban outside (the Azarah) he is chayuv for the shechting and chayuv for the offering up. **R’ Yose Haglili** says, if he shechted it inside but offered it outside he is chayuv for the offering. However, if he shechted it outside and then offered it outside, he would not be chayuv for the offering, because he offered something that was already passul. The **Chachomim** said to him, when he shechts inside and then takes it out it becomes passul (and yet you agree that he would be chayuv for offering it, so when he shechted it outside it should be no different).
- If a tamei person ate kodesh that was itself tamei or was tahor, he is chayuv for eating kodesh while he is tamei. **R’ Yose Haglili** says, if a tamei person ate kodesh that was tahor he is chayuv, but if he ate kodesh that is tamei he is patur, because he ate something that was already tamei. The **Chachomim** said to him, when the tamei eats kodesh that is tahor, as soon as he touched the kodesh it became tamei (and yet you agree that he would be chayuv, so when he eats kodesh that is already tamei it should be no different).
 - If a tahor person ate kodesh that was tamei he is patur (from a chatas), because the chiyuv for a chatas is only for when a tamei person eats kodesh.

GEMARA

- **Q:** There is a pasuk that teaches the punishment for offering outside the Azarah – “v’ehl pesach Ohel Moed lo yivi’enu”, and there is a pasuk that gives the warning – “hishamer lecha pen taaleh olosecha”. However, with regard to shechting outside, although there is a pasuk that teaches the punishment – “v’ehl pesach Ohel Moed lo hevi’o”, there is no pasuk that teaches the warning!? **A:** The warning is the pasuk of “v’lo yizbichu ohd”.
 - **Q: R’ Elazar** uses this pasuk for a different drasha!? **A:** We darshen the pasuk as “v’lo yizbichu” and we darshen as if it was written “v’lo ohd”, and we therefore have two drashos.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that this pasuk is needed to teach regarding a korban that a person was makdish at a time when bamos were allowed and he then offered it outside the Mikdash at a time when bamos were no longer allowed, in which case there would be no chiyuv kares (or chatas), but only a lav!? **A:** Rather, **Abaye** said, it is learned from a kal v’chomer – if for a korban where there is no kares when it is shechted outside (the korban that he was makdish when bamos were allowed) there is still a warning, then for a korban where there is kares if it was shechted outside, there is for sure a warning of a lav as well (the lav is needed along with the chiyuv kares to obligate the person to bring a chatas)!
 - **Q: Ravina** said to **R’ Ashi**, if this is true, that when there is a chiyuv kares for something there is no need for the Torah to also write a lav, then the Torah should not write the lav for cheilev and it can be learned from a kal v’chomer from neveila – neveila doesn’t carry kares and yet it has a lav, then cheilev which does carry kares for sure has a lav!? **A: Rava** said, cheilev could not be learned from neveila, because we can ask that neveila is different because it gives off tumah. You also can’t learn cheilev from the lav against

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

eating tamei sheratzim, because we can ask that tamei sheratzim give off tumah with any small amount! You also can't learn cheilev from the lav against eating tahor sheratzim, because we can ask that tahor sheratzim are assur to be eaten even in a small amount (smaller than a kezayis)! You also can't learn cheilev from the lav against eating orlah or kelayim, because we can ask that they are different, because they are assur b'hana'ah! You also can't learn cheilev from the lav of shmitta produce, because we can ask that shmitta produce is different because its issur carries over to the money of the proceeds of its sale! You also can't learn cheilev from the lav against eating terumah (by a non-Kohen), because we can ask that it is different, because there is never a case where it is mutar (whereas the cheilev of a chaya is mutar)! You can't even learn cheilev from all the above combined, because of the reason that cheilev is different in that there are cases when it is mutar.

- **Rava** said, if there is a problem with **Abaye's** kal v'chomer, it is the following. A Mishna says that the mitzvos of Pesach and bris milah are only an assei. Now, according to **Abaye** we should make his kal v'chomer from the lav of nossar and say that Pesach and milah which have a chiyuv kares, certainly have a lav as well!? **A: R' Ashi** said, I repeated this to **R' Kahana** and he told me that they can't be learned from nossar, because nossar is different in that it can never be rectified (whereas a Pesach can be brought on Pesach Sheini, and a milah can always be done after the 8th day as well).
- **Q:** How could **Abaye** say that we learn the lav through a kal v'chomer? Even according to the view that we can punish based on a kal v'chomer, we cannot make assur with a lav through a kal v'chomer!? **A:** Rather, the source is like **R' Yochanan** said – we have a gezeira shava of “hava'ah” between offering outside and shechting outside. This teaches that just as for offering there is only punishment with having the lav, so too with regard to shechting outside there is a punishment and it is along with a lav. **A2: Rava** said, the source is based on a gezeira shava on the word “sham” between the offering and the shechting.

-----Daf 17-----107-----

- **Q:** The pesukim that we have dealt with so far teach that one is chayuv when a korbon was shected inside the Mikdash and is then offered outside the Mikdash. How does the **T”K** know that one who offers a korbon outside is chayuv even when the korbon was shected outside as well? **A: R' Kahana** said, the pasuk says “va'aleyhem tomar”, which teaches that the chiyuv applies to what was earlier discussed, which is an animal that was shected outside.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, that would make sense if the word “va'aleyhem” was written with an “ayin”, but it is in fact written with an “aleph”!? **A:** Rather, it is as a Braisa taught by **R' Yishmael** that says that the “vuv” combines the two parshiyos (of shechting outside and offering outside) to teach that the chiyuv of offering applies even if it was shected outside. **R' Yochanan** says, we learn it from a gezeira shava of “hava'ah” between shechting outside and offering outside.
 - **Q: R' Bibi** asked, a Mishna says that there are 36 chiyuvei krisus in the Torah, and goes on to list them. According to what we are saying there should be 37 – there is the one who offers outside a korbon that was shected inside, and the one who offers outside a korbon that was shected outside!? The Gemara remains with a KASHYEH.
- **Q:** The later Mishna says that one is chayuv for doing even a partial zrika outside the Mikdash. How do we know that one is chayuv for doing zrika outside? **A:** A Braisa says that **R' Yishmael** learns this from the words of “dam yeichasheiv” and **R' Akiva** learns it from “oy zavach”.
 - **R' Yishmael** uses the “oy zavach” to teach that one need not offer both an olah and shelamim in order to be chayuv. **R' Akiva** learns this from “lo yivi'enu” (written in the singular). **R' Yishmael** uses these words to teach that one is only chayuv for offering a complete thing (what this means is subject to a

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

machlokes in the later Gemara). **R' Akiva** learns this from “laasos oso”. **R' Yishmael** says that two pesukim are needed to teach that it must be complete – one for a korbon that was shechted inside and became incomplete and was then offered outside, and one for a korbon that was shechted outside and was then offered less than complete. **R' Akiva** actually holds that one would be chayuv for a korbon that was shechted inside which then became incomplete and was offered outside.

- **R' Akiva** uses the “dam yeichashev” to teach that one is also chayuv for offering outside a bird that was shechted. **R' Yishmael** learns this from the pasuk of “oy asher yishchat”. **R' Akiva** uses this to teach that one is only chayuv for *shechting* a bird korbon outside, not for *melika* of a bird korbon outside. **R' Yishmael** learns this from the words “zeh hadavar”. **R' Akiva** uses this for a gezeira shava.
- **Q:** A later Mishna says that one is not chayuv for doing a kemitza or a kabbalah outside the Mikdash. How do we know this? **A:** We don't need a source to teach that he would be patur, we would need a source to say that he is chayuv, and there is no such source! They can't be learned from shechita, because shechita is more stringent in that the shechita of a Pesach for people who cannot eat a kezayis of the korbon makes the korbon passul. It can't be learned from zrika, because zrika is more stringent in that a non-Kohen who does zrika is chayuv misah. You can't say that it should be learned from a tzad hashava between shechita and zrika, because if this chiyuv could be learned via a tzad hashava, the Torah should not have written a chiyuv for zrika and we should have learned it from a tzad hashava between shechita and offering it, as follows: zrika can't be learned from shechita, because shechita is more stringent in that the shechita of a Pesach for people who cannot eat a kezayis of the korbon makes the korbon passul. It can't be learned from the offering up of a korbon, because that even applies to the offering of a mincha, whereas zrika doesn't apply to a mincha. Now, we should be able to learn it with a tzad hashava between shechita and offering up. Yet, the Torah wrote a pasuk to teach the chiyuv of zrika, which shows that we can't learn this through a tzad hashava.
- **R' Avahu** said, if one shechted a korbon outside and did the zrika outside, according to **R' Yishmael** he would only be chayuv one chatas (since they are both learned from the same pasuk) and according to **R' Akiva** he would be chayuv two chataos. **Abaye** said, that even according to **R' Akiva** he would only be chayuv one chatas, because the pasuk says “sham taaseh”, which combines all avodos other than offering up, into one category.
 - **R' Avahu** said, if one did zrika outside and offered up the korbon outside, according to **R' Yishmael** he would be chayuv two chataos and according to **R' Akiva** he would be chayuv one chatas (since they are both learned from the same pasuk). **Abaye** said, that even according to **R' Akiva** he would be chayuv two chataos, because the pasuk separates the two by saying “sham taaseh” and “sham taaleh”.
 - **R' Avahu** said, if the person shechted outside, did zrika outside, and offered the korbon outside, according to all he would be chayuv two chataos.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk of “michutz lamachaneh” (it must be outside the machananeh) would seem to teach that one is only chayuv if he offered it outside all 3 machanos. The pasuk therefore says “bamachaneh” to teach that he would be chayuv even if he offered it in the machaneh leviyah. Based on that, we would think that one would even be chayuv for shechting an olah in the south of the Azarah (which is “outside” of its proper place). The pasuk therefore says “oy asher yishchat michutz lamachaneh”. This teaches that just as outside the machaneh refers to someplace that is not fit for any korbon, so too “bamachaneh” refers to such a place. This excludes the south of the Azarah, which although is not fit for kodshei kodashim, it is fit for kodshei kalim.
 - **Ulla** said, if someone shechts a korbon on the roof of the Heichal he would be chayuv for “shechting outside”, because the Heichal roof is not fit for the shechita of any korbon.
 - **Rava** asked, the pasuk of “ehl pesach Ohel Moed” seems to exclude liability for shechita on the roof of the Heichal!? The Gemara asks on **Rava**, if there are places in the Mikdash which are excluded from liability, why are the pesukim of “bamachaneh” and “michutz lamachaneh” needed? The pasuk of “ehl pesach Ohel Moed” should be enough!? Rather, it must be that it is needed, to include the roof of the Heichal as a place where he would be chayuv for shechting there! **R' Mari** answered for **Rava**, the pesukim are needed to teach that if the animal's body is inside the Azarah and its neck is outside, and he shechts it like that, he would be chayuv.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** That is obvious that he would be chayuv in that case, because the shechita is happening outside the Azarah!? **A:** Rather, it is needed to include the case of where the entire animal is outside the Azarah, but the neck is inside.
- If someone offers a korbon outside the Mikdash in today's times (when there is no Mikdash), **R' Yochanan** says he would be chayuv, because the original kedusha remains in effect forever and bamos remain assur, and **Reish Lakish** says he would be patur, because the original kedusha does not remain in effect forever and bamos therefore become mutar again.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that they argue in the machlokes between **R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua** in a Mishna, where **R' Eliezer** discusses the various curtains that were put up in the second Beis Hamikdash and **R' Yehoshua** then says that he heard that they would offer korbanos and eat korbanos even though there were no curtains. Presumably **R' Yehoshua** is arguing on **R' Eliezer** and **R' Yehoshua** holds that the original kedusha remains in effect whereas **R' Eliezer** holds that it does not! **A:** It may be that they both agree that the original kedusha remains in effect, and each one was just reporting what they had heard, but are not actually arguing.
- If someone offers a korbon outside the Mikdash, but there is less than a kezayis of meat, but with the bone that it is attached to it there is a kezayis, **R' Yochanan** says he is chayuv because things attached to the korbon have the status of the korbon itself, and **Reish Lakish** says he is patur because things attached to the korbon do not have the status of the korbon itself.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, what if someone offers the head of a bird which is smaller than the size of a kezayis, but with the salt that is on it there is a kezayis, would he be chayuv?
 - **Q: Rava MiPrazakya** asked **R' Ashi**, this seems to be subject to the machlokes of **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish**!? **A:** The Gemara says, this question can be asked according to the view of **R' Yochanan**, because he may mean that only a bone, which is from the animal, is considered to have the status of the korbon, but salt may be different. It can also be asked according to the view of **Reish Lakish**, because he may say that bones don't get the status of the korbon, because there is no mitzvah to offer the bones of the korbon, but there is a mitzvah to offer salt along with the korbon, so maybe salt does get the status of the korbon. Because of this, the Gemara remains with a **TEIKU**.

-----Daf פ"ק---108-----

R' YOSE HAGLILI OMER...

- **Rebbi** answered on behalf of **R' Yose Haglili**, that the reason one is chayuv when one shechts a korbon inside the Azarah and then offers it outside is because there was a period of validity for this korbon, whereas when it is shechted outside and offered outside he is be patur for the offering, because this korbon never had a period of validity. **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** answered on behalf of **R' Yose Haglili**, that the reason one is chayuv when one shechts a korbon inside the Azarah and then offers it outside is because if it is taken out after the shechita and then brought back in and brought up onto the Mizbe'ach, it would be offered and would not be taken down. However, if it was shechted outside, even if it was then brought inside and brought up onto the Mizbe'ach, it would not be offered and would be taken down.
 - **Q:** What is the difference between these two answers? **A: Ze'iri** said, the difference would be a case where the shechita inside took place at night (this korbon would have no period of validity, but if it was brought up onto the Mizbe'ach it would not be taken down). **Rabbah** said the difference would be a case where the kabbalah was done in a keili that was not a kli kodesh (this korbon would have no period of validity, but if it was brought up onto the Mizbe'ach it would not be taken down).

TAMEI SHE'ACHAL BEIN KODESH...

- **Q:** The **Rabanan** seem to have posed a very strong question to **R' Yose**!? **A: Rava** said, if the person first became tamei and the meat of the korbon then became tamei, all would agree that he would be chayuv for eating that meat, because a tamei person eating kodashim is chayuv kares. The machlokes is where the meat was first tamei and then the person became tamei. In this case the meat was already assur to be eaten as tamei kodashim, which does not carry kares. The **Rabanan** say that when the person becomes tamei there is "issur kolel" (since

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

he now becomes assur to eat even tahor kodashim) and the issur with kares even takes effect on tamei kodashim as well. **R' Yose Haglili** does not agree to the principle of issur kolel, and therefore the issur of a tamei person eating kodashim will not take effect on a tamei piece of kodashim, since it was already assur to be eaten.

- **Q: R' Yose** should hold that the issur of the tamei person should take effect, because the issur of a tamei person eating kodesh is more stringent in that he would be chayuv kares (as we find that he says this logic elsewhere)!? **A: R' Ashi** said, it may be that the issur of tamei kodashim is more stringent in that the tumah cannot be removed from it by immersing it in a mikvah. Therefore, we can't say that one is more stringent than the other.

MISHNA

- There is a chumra that the issur of shechita outside has over the issur of offering a korbun outside, and there is a chumra that the issur of offering has over the issur of shechita.
 - The chumra of shechita is that if someone shechts a korbun outside the Azarah with intent to shecht it for a person to eat, he would be chayuv, whereas if someone offers a korbun outside to a person (in worship of the person) he would be patur.
 - The chumra of offering is that if two people hold the knife and do a shechita outside they would be patur. However, if two people hold onto a limb of an animal and offer it up outside, they would be chayuv.
- If a person offered up a piece of the animal, and then offered up another piece, and another, **R' Shimon** says he would be chayuv a separate chatas for each act of offering up. **R' Yose** says he would be chayuv only one korbun. He would also not be chayuv unless he offers the korbun on top of a Mizbe'ach. **R' Shimon** says he would be chayuv even if he offered it up on a rock or stone.

GEMARA

- **Q:** One who offers up a korbun outside to a person is patur, because the pasuk says "LaHashem". The pasuk regarding shechita outside also says "LaHashem", so one who shechts for a person should also be patur!? **A:** The pasuk regarding shechita says "ish ish", which teaches that he is chayuv even if he shechted for a person.
 - **Q:** Regarding offering the korbun the pasuk also says "ish ish"!? **A:** That is needed to teach that if two people together offer a limb, they are chayuv.
 - **Q:** If so, "ish ish" written regarding shechita should also teach that if two people hold the knife and do the shechita they should be chayuv!? **A:** The pasuk regarding shechita says "hahu", which teaches that only when one person does the shechita he is chayuv.
 - **Q:** The pasuk regarding offering up the korbun also says "hahu", and should therefore teach that only when one person does the offering is he chayuv!? **A:** That "hahu" is needed to teach that one who offered up b'shoge, or b'oneis, or was misled into thinking it was mutar, that they are patur.
 - **Q:** The "hahu" written regarding shechita should be used to teach this as well!? **A:** The pasuk regarding shechita says "hahu" twice.
 - **Q:** If so, what does the word "LaHashem" in the pasuk of shechita come to teach? **A:** It comes to exclude the goat that is to be sent to the Azazel, and teaches that if that goat is shechted outside, the person would be patur.

CHOMER B'HALA'AH...

- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon** says, the pasuk regarding offering up the korbun outside says "ish ish", which teaches that if two people hold onto the limb and offer it, they are both chayuv. We would have thought to make a kal v'chomer and say that if for shechita outside, where he is chayuv if he shechts it for a person, he is patur if two people do the shechita, then for offering outside, where he is patur if he offered for a person, then surely if two people offer it together they should be patur. **R' Yose** says that "hahu" teaches that if two people offer it together they would be patur. The pasuk only says "ish ish" because the Torah writes in verbiage like people speak.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Shimon** uses “hahu” to teach that one who offered up b’shogege, or b’oneis, or was misled into thinking it was mutar, that they are patur. **R' Yose** says the pasuk could have said “hu” and instead says “hahu”, which allows for 2 drashos. **R' Shimon** doesn’t darshen two drashos from this one word.
- **Q:** According to **R' Yose**, if the “ish ish” written regarding offering outside is not meant to be darshened, the same should be said for the “ish ish” written regarding shechting outside. If so, how does he know that one who shechts for a person is chayuv? **A:** He learns it from the pasuk of “dam yeichashev *la'ish hahu*”, which teaches that even if he shechts for a person, he is chayuv.

HE'ELA V'CHAZAR V'HE'ELA...

- **Reish Lakish** said, the machlokes is where one offers up multiple limbs from a korbon. In this case **R' Yose** holds that the pasuk says “laasos oso”, which teaches that he is only chayuv for offering up the entire korbon, whereas **R' Shimon** says this teaches that he is chayuv separately for each limb. However, all would agree that if he offers up one limb in parts, he would only be chayuv one chatas. **R' Yochanan** said, the machlokes is regarding a case where one offers up a part of one limb from an animal that was shechted inside. **R' Shimon** says he would be chayuv, because the only time a full limb is needed to make him chayuv is when the korbon was shechted outside, and **R' Yose** says that he would be patur, because he is only chayuv for the offering outside of a full limb. However, if a person offered 4 or 5 limbs outside, all would agree that he would be chayuv a chatas for each and every limb that was offered up. This argues on **Ulla**, who said that **R' Shimon and R' Yose** agree that if a korbon was shechted inside and was then offered in part (even a partial limb) outside, that he would be chayuv. The machlokes is only regarding a korbon that was shechted outside and was then offered up in part. In that case **R' Yose** would say that he is patur and **R' Shimon** would say that he is chayuv. **Another version of Ulla** is that he says that all agree that regarding a korbon that was shechted outside and was then offered up in part that he would be patur. The machlokes is regarding a korbon that was shechted inside and was then offered in part, in which case **R' Yose** would say that he is patur and **R' Shimon** would say that he is chayuv.
 - The first version of **Ulla** argues on **Shmuel's** father, who said that **R' Yose** would hold that if partial pieces pop out of the fire on the Mizbe'ach they need not be put back into the fire.

V'EINO CHAYUV AHD SHEYAALAH...

- **R' Huna** said, **R' Yose's** view is based on the pasuk of “vayiven Noach Mizbe'ach LaHashem”, which shows that it must be an erected Mizbe'ach, not just any rock. **R' Yochanan** said that **R' Shimon's** view is based on the pasuk of “vayikach Mano'ach es gedi ha'izim v'es hamincha vayaal ahl hatzur (on the rock) LaHashem”.
 - **R' Shimon** would say that Noach built a taller Mizbe'ach only so that it should be easier to offer the korbon. **R' Yose** would say that Mano'ach offered the korbon on a rock, because he was told to do so by a Malach, and therefore that can't be used as a basis for future times.
 - We can also say that **R' Shimon's** view is as he says in a Braisa, that a Mizbe'ach is only needed for the Mikdash, but not for when bamos were allowed.
 - **Q: R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** asked, if a Mizbe'ach is needed for a bamah, does this Mizbe'ach need to have the horns, a ramp, a base, and be square like the Mizbe'ach in the Mikdash? **A: R' Yirmiya** said, these things are only needed for the large bamah that was used for the tzibbur, but would not be needed for an individual's bamah.

-----Daf 109-----

MISHNA

- Whether it is a valid korbon or a korbon that was passul with a psul of Kodesh, and a person then offered it up outside, he would be chayuv. If someone offered up a (combined) kezayis of an olah and its eimurim outside, he would be chayuv.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “asher yaaleh olah”. This teaches that one is chayuv for offering up an olah outside. How do we know that this applies to the eimurim of an asham, of a chatas, of other kodshei kodashim, or of kodashim kalim? The pasuk therefore says “zavach”. How do we know to include the kometz of a mincha, ketores, the mincha of a Kohen, of the Kohen Gadol, or one who pours 3 lugim of wine or water? The pasuk

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

therefore says “v’ehl pesach Ohel Moed lo yivi’enu”. This teaches that anything that is fit to be brought to the Azarah as a korbon would make a person chayuv if he offers it outside. This all teaches regarding valid korbanos. How do we know to include passul korbanos, for example a korbon that became passul with linah, or that left the Azarah, or that become tamei, or that was shechted with beyond its time or beyond its place intent, or whose kabbalah was done and zrika was done by someone who was passul, or whose blood should have been applied below the line and was instead applied above the line, or visa-versa, or whose blood was applied outside the Heichal when it should have been applied inside, or visa-versa, or a Pesach or chatas that was shechted not lishma? The pasuk says “lo yivi’enu laasos”. This teaches that a korbon that would be accepted in the Azarah would make one chayuv if he offered them outside (and these passul korbanos would be accepted in the sense that if they were brought up onto the Mizbe’ach they would not be taken down).

HAMAALEH KEZAYIS MIN HA’OLAH...

- The Mishna seems to say that the meat and eimurim of an olah would be combined for the minimum size of a kezayis, but the meat and eimurim of a shelamim would not be combined. This is implied by a Braisa as well. The Braisa says, the meat and eimurim of an olah combine for the size of a kezayis needed to make one chayuv for offering it up outside the Azarah and to make them chayuv for piggul, nossar, and tamei. This implies that the same would not be true for the meat and eimurim of a shelamim.
 - **Q:** It makes sense why the olah is combined to make him chayuv for offering outside since the meat and eimurim are all burned on the Mizbe’ach (whereas the meat of a shelamim is not burned on the Mizbe’ach). However, why are they treated differently for purposes of piggul and nossar? A Mishna says that the meat and eimurim of a shelamim are both subject to these halachos and should therefore be combined just like those of an olah!? The Mishna is referring to the chiyuv for eating piggul. The Braisa is referring to the intent to make piggul (the piggul intent for the shelamim meat must be to eat it beyond its time, whereas the piggul intent for the eimurim must be to burn it beyond its time; for an olah the intent for the meat and the eimurim is to burn it beyond its time). With regard to nossar, the Mishna is referring to the chiyuv for eating nossar and the Braisa is referring to whether meat and eimurim become nossar if they are left over from a korbon that was destroyed before the zrika, and it follows **R’ Yehoshua** who says in a Braisa that a zrika cannot be done if all that remains from the shelamim is a half kezayis of meat and a half kezayis of eimurim, but if it was an olah that had that left over, a zrika could be done.

MISHNA

- With regard to the kometz of a mincha, the levonah, the ketores, the mincha of a Kohen, the mincha of the Kohen Gadol, or the minchas nesachim, if one offered a kezayis of one of these outside the Azarah, he is chayuv. **R’ Elazar** says he is patur unless he offered the entire korbon (e.g., the full kometz, or the full levonah, etc.).
 - If any of these were offered inside (as they should be) and a kezayis of them was left over and offered outside, he is chayuv for offering it outside.
 - If any of these were missing from the original amount that it was, and a person offered from the remaining amount outside, he is patur.
- If one offers the meat of a korbon along with the eimurim outside, he is chayuv.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if one burns a kezayis of ketores outside, he is chayuv. If he burns half of a peras inside, he is patur.
 - **Q:** The Gemara understood “patur” to refer to a non-Kohen who offered the half peras. The Gemara asks, why should he be patur? If one is chayuv for offering even a kezayis outside, the non-Kohen should also be chayuv for offering even less than a peras inside!? **A: R’ Zeira in the name of R’ Chisda in the name of R’ Yirmiya bar Abba in the name of Rav** said, when the Braisa says “patur” it means that if a half peras was offered inside, the tzibbur is patur from having to offer more ketores.
 - **Q: R’ Zeira** said, what I find difficult with this Braisa is the statement of **Rav** on the Braisa, which was that even **R’ Elazar** would agree that the tzibbur’s obligation is fulfilled with half a peras. In

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

our Mishna **R' Elazar** said that burning less than the full amount is not considered to be the offering of the ketores, so how could he say that the tzibbur is yotzeh with the offering of half a peras!? **A: Rabbah** said, with regard to burning the daily ketores in the Heichal all agree that even the burning of a kezayis is sufficient to fulfil the obligation and to make one chayuv for offering a kezayis outside. The machlokes is regarding the ketores offered in the Kodesh Hakodashim on Yom Kippur. **R' Elazar** says that the pasuk says “melo chafnav” (his two handfuls) and therefore he would be yotzeh with nothing less and would not be chayuv for offering anything less than that outside. The **Rabanan** hold that the amount associated with this ketores can even be less than the handfuls, even as little as a kezayis.

- **Q: Abaye** asked, in regard to the ketores offered in the Kodesh Hakodashim the pasuk says language of “chuka”, which means that the 2 handfuls amount is an absolute requirement!? **A:** Rather, **Abaye** said, with regard to the ketores of the Kodesh Hakodashim all would agree that the 2 handfuls amount is an absolute requirement. The machlokes is regarding the chiyuv for burning the Yom Kippur ketores outside the Azarah. The **Rabanan** say we learn this chiyuv from the chiyuv of burning the daily ketores outside – just as that carries a chiyuv for the burning of a kezayis, the same is with the ketores of Yom Kippur. **R' Elazar** holds that we do not learn the ketores of the Kodesh Hakodashim from the daily ketores.
- **Q: Rava** asked, we find that the **Rabanan** don't even learn the chiyuv of offering outside one type of korbon from another type of korbon, even when they are both korbanos that are offered on the outside Mizbe'ach, and you will now say that they learn the ketores of the Kodesh Hakodashim from the daily ketores offered in the Heichal!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, that the Mishna is referring to where the person put two half peras measures into the keili to be offered for the daily ketores. **R' Elazar** holds that placing this amount into the keili has significance to the point that offering less than this full amount outside will not make him chayuv. The **Rabanan** attach no significance to this placing into a keili and therefore hold that even if he burns as little as a kezayis outside, he would be chayuv.
 - **Rava** said, according to the **Rabanan** who attach no significance to this placing into a keili, if a person put 6 lugin of wine into a keili to be used for the nesachim of a par, and he then took 4 of those 6 and poured them outside, he would be chayuv, since 4 lugin is the amount needed when bringing a ram as a korbon. If he put 4 lugin into a keili for use with a ram and he then took 3 of them and poured them outside, he would be chayuv since 3 lugin is enough when bringing a lamb as a korbon. If even a drop less than 3 lugin are poured outside, he would be patur.
 - **R' Ashi** answered **Rava's** question on **Abaye** by saying that when the **Rabanan** don't learn one type of korbon from another, that was that they don't learn the halachos of nisuch (pouring) from burning. This is so, even though both are cases of things that are offered on the outside Mizbe'ach. However, we can say that they do learn the halachos regarding burning from other halachos of burning even when one is something that is burned in the Kodesh Hakodashim and the other is burned in the Heichal.

-----Daf י"ק-----110-----

V'KULAN SHECHASRU

- **Q:** If any of the offerings in the Mishna were taken out of the Azarah when they were complete and then some was missing, is that considered to be less than a complete offering and the one who offers it outside will therefore be patur, or not? Do we say that since it anyway became passul by leaving the Azarah it doesn't make

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

a difference if it is complete, or do we say that one is only chayuv for offering up a complete offering outside, not anything less? **A: Abaye** said, the Mishna said that **R' Elazar** said that he is patur unless he offers all of it.

- **Q: Rabbah bar R' Chanan** said to **Abaye**, the question was asked according to the view of the **Rabanan**, and you answer based on the view of **R' Elazar**!? **A: Abaye** said, "I explicitly heard from **Rav** that the **Rabanan** and **R' Elazar** only argue in a case where the offering is complete, but where it is less than complete the **Rabanan** agree that the person would not be chayuv for offering it outside." Now, presumably the case is that it became less than complete outside the Azarah, and we see that the **Rabanan** hold that even in this case the person would be patur!
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. The case in which they argue may be where it became less inside the Azarah, but in a case where it became less outside, it may be that the **Rabanan** would say that he is chayuv.
- **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from the Mishna which said that if any of the offerings listed in the Mishna were less than complete and were then offered outside he would be patur. Presumably, this refers to where it became less than complete outside! **A:** It may be referring to where it became less than complete inside.

HAMAKRIV KODASHIM

- **Q:** Why is one chayuv for offering eimurim that are attached to meat? The meat acts as a chatzitza between the eimurim and the Mizbe'ach!? **A: Shmuel** said, the case is where he turns the pieces over so that the eimurim are touching the Mizbe'ach. **R' Yochanan** said, it may be talking about where he didn't turn the pieces over, but the Mishna follows the view of **R' Shimon** who says that he is chayuv for offering on any rock, and a Mizbe'ach is not needed. Therefore, he would also hold that a chatzitza would not be a problem. **Rav** said, that the meat would not be a chatzitza, because they are all parts of the animal and things of like kind are not considered to be a chatzitza.

MISHNA

- If the kemitza was not taken from a mincha and a person offered the mincha outside, he is patur. If a kemitza was separated and then put back in with the rest of the mincha and a person then offered it outside, he would be chayuv.

GEMARA

- **Q:** When the kometz is returned to the rest of the mincha, why don't we say that the rest of the mincha is mevatel the kometz, and if so the person who offers it outside should be patur, because he did not offer a kometz outside!? **A: R' Zeira** said, we have a gezeira shava of "haktara" between the kometz and the leftover mincha. This teaches that just as one kometz does not become batel in another kometz, so too leftover mincha is not mevatel a kometz.

MISHNA

- If only one of the kometz and the levonah was offered outside, he would be chayuv. **R' Elazar** says he would be patur until he offers the other one as well. If he offered one inside and one outside, all would agree that he would be chayuv.
- With regard to the two spoons of levonah of the Lechem Hapanim, of which one was offered outside, he would be chayuv. **R' Elazar** says he would be patur unless he offers the second spoon as well. If one was offered inside and the other outside, he would be chayuv.

GEMARA

- **R' Yitzchak Nafcha** asked, what is the halacha whether a kometz can be matir part of the leftover mincha (that he says corresponds to it) without having offered the levonah? Do we say that the offering of the kometz weakens the issur on the entire mincha, but it does not get removed totally until the levonah is offered as well, or do we say that the offering of the kometz entirely removes the issur from part of the mincha?

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Who is this question asked according to? It can't be asked according to **R' Meir**, because he says that one can even create piggul with an intent during the offering of the kemitza, so he surely holds that it entirely removes the issur from part of the mincha! It can't be asked according to the **Rabanan**, because they say that this intent would not create piggul, which means that they hold that the offering of the kometz only weakens the issur, but does not remove it entirely! It can't be according to **R' Elazar** in our Mishna (who said that he is patur for offering the kometz outside without the levonah), because he clearly follows the **Rabanan!** **A:** Rather, the question is according to the **Rabanan** in our Mishna (who say he is chayuv for the offering of the kometz or the levonah alone). The question is, does it only weaken the issur or does it totally remove the issur? The Gemara says **TEIKU**.

MISHNA

- If a person does a partial zrika outside he is chayuv. **R' Elazar** said, one who pours the waters of the Chag outside on the Chag would also be chayuv. **R' Nechemya** said, if one offered the leftover blood of a korbon outside, he would be chayuv.

GEMARA

- **Rava** said, **R' Elazar** would agree that one who did a partial zrika outside would be chayuv, because we find that he holds in a Mishna that a partial zrika makes a korbon valid when done properly.

R' ELAZAR OMER AHF HAMENASECH MEI HACHAG BACHAG BACHUTZ

- **R' Yochanan in the name of R' Menachem Yodfa'ah** said, **R' Elazar** is following the view of his rebbi **R' Akiva**, who holds that pouring of the water on Succos is D'Oraisa, based on a drasha in a pasuk that teaches that there is a pouring of something in addition to the pouring of wine.
 - **Q: Reish Lakish** asked, if that is true, he should say that just as there must be 3 lugin of wine poured, there must also be 3 lugin of water poured, but in the Mishna he referred to one who "pours water", which suggests that there is no 3 lug requirement!? Also, he should compare it to the pouring of wine and say that just as one is chayuv if he pours wine outside at any time during the year, the same should be true for the pouring of water, and yet **R' Elazar** in the Mishna says "bachag" (on the chag)!? **A Reish Lakish** said, **R' Menachem Yodfa'ah** must have forgotten the statement of **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan in the name of R' Nechunya of Bikas Beis Chorson**, who said that the requirement to pour water is learned from a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai, not based on the pasuk, and therefore there is no comparison between it and the pouring of wine.
- A Braisa says, if one pours 3 lugin of water outside on Succos, he is chayuv. **R' Elazar** says, if he filled a keili with them to make it kadosh to be used for Succos, he would be chayuv.
 - **Q:** What is the practical difference between these views? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, they argue on whether there is a maximum amount associated with the pouring of water for Succos. The **T"K** holds there is no maximum, and therefore when it is taken in any keili it can become kadosh, and he only mentions that it must be at least 3 lugin. **R' Elazar** holds that it cannot be more than 3 lugin, and therefore he is only chayuv if he took the water in a proper sized kli shareis in the proper amount of 3 lugin. **A2: R' Pappa** said, they argue regarding whether they brought nesachim in the Midbar. **R' Elazar** says they were not brought, which (based on drashos of pesukim) then means that he holds nesachim were never brought on private bamos. This means that nesachim were only brought in a kli shares. Therefore, he holds that one would only be chayuv if he brought the nesachim outside after it was in a kli shareis. The **T"K** holds that nesachim were brought on private bamos, without a kli shares, and therefore one would be chayuv for bringing nesachim outside even if it was never put into a kli shares. **A3: Ravina** said, all agree that nesachim were brought in the Midbar, which means they were also brought on private bamos. The machlokes is whether we learn the pouring of the water from the pouring of the wine. The **T"K** says that we do, and therefore the person is chayuv even if the water was never put into a kli shareis, just as he would be for wine, and **R' Elazar** says that we don't, and therefore a person is only chayuv for pouring water outside when it was first put into a kli shareis.