



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

### Zevachim Daf Chuf Ches

#### MISHNA

- If someone shechts a korbon with intent to do zrika outside the area where it is allowed, or to do zrika on part of the blood outside the allowable area, or he intends to burn the parts that must be burned on the Mizbe'ach at a place beyond where they may be burned or to do so for part of these parts, or he intends to eat the meat outside the allowable area or even a to eat a kezayis of the meat outside the allowable area, or to eat a kezayis of the skin of the tail outside the allowable area, the korbon is passul, but there is no kares if someone then eats from this korbon.
- If someone shechts a korbon with intent to do zrika beyond the allowable time or to do zrika on part of the blood beyond the allowable time, or he intends to burn the parts that must be burned on the Mizbe'ach beyond the allowable time or to do so for part of these parts, or he intends to eat the meat beyond the allowable time or even a to eat a kezayis of the meat beyond the allowable time, or to eat a kezayis of the skin of the tail beyond the allowable time, the korbon is piggul and there is kares if someone then eats from this korbon.

#### GEMARA

- They thought that the skin of the tail has the status of the tail itself (and must be burned on the Mizbe'ach along with the tail).
  - **Q:** Based on this, when the Mishna says that he intended to eat the skin of the tail beyond its place or time, it means that he has an intention of eating for something that is meant to be burned on the Mizbe'ach, so why would it make the korbon passul!? **A:** **Shmuel** said, the Mishna follows the view of **R' Eliezer**, who argues on the **Rabanan** in a Mishna and says that when an intent is made to eat something that is meant to be burned, or to burn something that is meant to be eaten, beyond its place or time, it does make the korbon passul.
    - **Q:** The later part of our Mishna says that if someone does one of the avodos with intent to eat something that is meant to be eaten or to burn something that is meant to be burned, beyond its place or time, it is passul. The Mishna suggests that if the intent was to eat something that is meant to be burned, or visa-versa, it would not be passul. Can it be that the first part of the Mishna (our Mishna) follows **R' Eliezer** and the later part follows the **Rabanan**!? **A:** **Shmuel** said, yes, the first part follows **R' Eliezer** and the later part follows the **Rabanan**.
    - **R' Huna** said, the skin of the tail does not have the status of the tail. **Rava** explained, this is based on the pasuk that requires the burning of the "chelbo ha'alya" – the fats of the tail must be burned, not the skin.
    - **R' Chisda** said, that the skin of the tail does have the status of the tail. Our Mishna is referring to the tail of a goat, which is not burned on the Mizbe'ach (only the tail of a sheep is burned on the Mizbe'ach).
    - **R' Huna and R' Chisda** don't want to say like **Shmuel**, because they don't want parts of the same Mishna to have to follow different opinions. **Shmuel and R' Chisda** don't want to say like **R' Huna**, because they hold that the skin of the tail has the status of the tail. **Shmuel and R' Huna** don't want to say like **R' Chisda**, because according to him the Mishna is coming to teach that the skin of the tail has the status of the tail (and since it is edible, an intent regarding it makes the korbon passul). They hold this teaching is not needed, because another Mishna clearly teaches that the skin under the tail has the status of meat. **R' Chisda** said, that from that Mishna we would think it is only so for purposes of tumah, but

for purposes of a korbon only things which are eaten by kings are considered fit to be eaten, and therefore this skin should not be considered something fit to be eaten. The Mishna therefore teaches that for purposes of these bad intents the skin of the tail is considered to be something that is eaten.

- **Q:** A Braisa says that an olah that is shechted with intent to burn a kezayis of the skin of the tail makes the korbon passul. The Braisa suggests that this is only the case for an olah, but not for other korbanos. Now, according to **R' Huna** this is not difficult, because only the skin of the tail of an olah is burned. However, according to **R' Chisda**, why does the Braisa limit its halacha to an olah? **A:** **R' Chisda** would say, either the Braisa is discussing the tail of a goat, which is only burned by an olah, or we will say that the Braisa should be amended to take out the word olah and insert the word “zevach” (referring to all korbanos).

#### PASSUL V'EIN BO KARES...

- **Q:** How do we know that a beyond the place intent makes the korbon passul but there is no kares, and a beyond the time intent makes it passul and there is kares? **A:** **Shmuel** said, there are two pesukim – one refers to beyond the place and the other to beyond the time, and only the one of beyond the time states that there is kares.
  - **Q:** What are the pesukim? **A:** **Rabbah** said, when the pasuk says “shlishi” it refers to an intent for beyond its time, and when the pasuk then says “piggul” it refers to an intent beyond its place. The pasuk then says “v'hanefesh ha'очеles mimenu” – which is written in the singular and teaches that only one of these intents carries the kares penalty, and it is the intent of beyond its time, not the intent of beyond its place.
    - **Q:** Maybe the kares penalty applies to beyond the place and excludes beyond the time!? **A:** It is logical to say that beyond its time is worse, since (as we darshened above) that it is discussed earlier in the pasuk.
    - **Q:** If anything it is more logical to say that beyond its place is the one that carries kares, since it is written closer to the punishment of “v'hanefesh ha'очеles mimenu”!? **A:** Rather, **Abaye** said that **R' Yitzchak bar Avdimi in the name of Rabbah** said, the Mishna is learning from a Braisa. The Braisa says, there is a pasuk in Parshas Kedoshim that discusses piggul. This pasuk seems unnecessary, since we have the other pasuk (quoted in part above) in Parshas Tzav that discusses piggul. It must be that the pasuk in Tzav (which mentions kares) discusses beyond its time and the pasuk in Kedoshim (which makes no mention of kares) discusses beyond its place. Although the very next pasuk in Kedoshim mentions kares, that pasuk limits the kares to the one who eats “nossar”, as the pasuk says “v'ochlav avono yisa” – the one who eats *it*, and not the one who eats the korbon which had intent for beyond its place.
      - **Q:** Maybe the pasuk of “v'ochlav avono yisa” refers to the korbon with intent for beyond its place and comes to exclude one who eats nossar from the penalty of kares? **A:** It makes sense to say that nossar is referred to in the pasuk of kares, because we can then darshen the gezeira shava of “avon” to the case of intent for beyond its time, which is similar to nossar in that they both are a function of time, and both apply even to a korbon brought on a bamah.
      - **Q:** It makes more sense to say that beyond its place is what is meant by the pasuk, because we can then darshen the gezeira shava of “avon” to the case of intent for beyond its time, which is similar to beyond its place in that they are both based on intent, they make the entire korbon passul even if the intent was made only on a portion of the korbon, they both can only take place during the 4 blood avodos, and both are learned from the words “the third day” in their respective pesukim!? **A:** Rather, **R' Yochanan** said, **Zavdi bar Levi** taught a Braisa that says, that we have a gezeira shava on the word kodesh. In Kedoshim the pasuk says “es kodesh Hashem chilel v'nichrisa”, and another pasuk regarding nossar says “v'sarafta es hanossar ba'eish lo yei'acheil ki kodesh”. Just as the second pasuk is referring to nossar, the first pasuk is referring to nossar as well. The pasuk says “v'ochlav” which

is an exclusionary term, and therefore excludes the intent of beyond its place from the kares penalty.

- **Q:** Why do we say that the long pasuk in Tzav refers to intent of beyond its time and the pasuk in Kedoshim refers to intent for beyond its place? Maybe we should say that the reverse is true? **A:** It makes sense to say that the long pasuk in Tzav refers to intent for beyond its time, because the gezeira shava of “avon” will teach that the pasuk in Tzav carries the kares penalty, and it makes more sense to say that intent for beyond its time is the one that is compared to nossar with this gezeira shava, because it is similar to nossar in that they both are a function of time and both apply even for a korbon offered on a bamah.
- **Q:** Maybe it makes more sense to say that the long pasuk in Tzav refers to intent for beyond its place and the pasuk in Kedoshim refers to intent for beyond its time, and the reason that intent for beyond its time is put there is so that it be next to nossar, which is written right next to that pasuk!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** says that all the halachos (intent for beyond its time, intent for beyond its place, and that only intent for beyond its time carries kares) are all learned from the long pasuk in Tzav. The pasuk should be darshened as follows:
  - “Hei’achol yei’acheil” – refers to two consumptions, human consumption and consumption of the Mizbe’ach.
  - “Mibsar zevach shelamav” – all korbanos are compared to a shelamim: just as a shelamim has a part that creates the piggul and a part that is subject to the issur of piggul, so too any korbon that has those aspects can be subject to piggul.
  - “Shlishi” – this refers to intent for beyond its time.
  - “Lo yeiratzeh” – just as a korbon does not become valid until all the avodos are completed, so too a korbon cannot become piggul unless all the avodos end up being completed (if the blood spills before the zrika the korbon cannot become piggul even if there was intent for beyond its time).
  - “Hamakriv” – it becomes piggul through being offered with the intent, not from actually being eaten after its time.
  - “Oso” – it is the korbon that becomes passul, not the Kohen who had the intent.
  - “Lo yeichasheiv” – it only becomes piggul if there were not other bad intentions that also make it passul at the time.
  - “Piggul” – this refers to intent for beyond its place.
  - “Yihiyeh” – this teaches that the two types of intent can combine to make the korbon passul (if each intent was had on only half a kezayis).
  - “V’hanefesh ha’ocheles mimenu” – only one of the intents creates a kares obligation – it is the intent for beyond its time. This is based on the gezeira shava of “avon” and the fact that this intent is similar to nossar in that they both are a function of time and both apply even for a korbon offered on a bamah.
- **Q: R’ Pappa** asked **Rava**, according to you, what does the “shlishi” in the pasuk in Kedoshim come to teach? **A: Rava** said, it teaches that the place in the intent for beyond its place must be a place which is sometimes fit for consumption of blood, of meat, and of “eimurim” (this comes to exclude an intent for beyond its place where the intent was for inside the Heichal).
  - **Q:** Why can’t that be learned from the pasuk in Tzav, from the fact that it uses the word “shlishi” there? **A: R’ Ashi** said that **R’ Masna** told him that if we only had that pasuk we would have thought to darshen that “shlishi” is a prat and “piggul” is a klal, which would include all places.