



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

Zevachim Daf Lamed Gimmel

- The Gemara had quoted the view of **Ulla in the name of Reish Lakish** that a partial entry into the Azarah is considered to be a full entry.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can support this from a Braisa. The Braisa says that the shechita of all korbanos must immediately follow the semicha (without moving to another place) except for the shechita of the korban of a metzora, because the semicha had to be done at the Niknor Gate, because the metzora could not enter the Azarah until after having the blood applied to him. Since the shechita had to be done in the north of the Azarah, the semicha was done and the animal was then moved inside. Now, if partial entry is not deemed to be full entry, why couldn't the metzora stick his hands from the Niknor Gate into the northern half of the Azarah and have the shechita immediately follow the semicha? It must be that a partial entry into the Azarah is considered to be a full entry! **A: R' Yosef** said this is no proof. The Braisa may follow the view of **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda**, who says that a korban that has to be shechted in the north of the Azarah could not be shechted right near the Niknor Gate, because it would have to be much deeper into the Azarah (he has a more limited understanding of the area considered to be "north").
 - **Q:** If so, why couldn't they make another door further north, opposite the area where the korban could be shechted, and then have the metzora's semicha and the shechita done, one immediately following the other? **A: Abaye and Rava** said that the entire structure of the Mikdash was given to us by Hashem, and therefore we may not add or change anything.
 - **Another version of R' Yosef** is that he said that semicha in the Azarah would require the head and most of the body of the metzora to enter the Azarah, because semicha must be done using all the strength of the person. Therefore, the reason it could not be done there is because most of his body would have to enter, and there is no proof that a partial entry is considered to be a full entry.
 - **Q:** What does the Braisa hold? If it holds that the semicha of a metzora is required D'Oraisa *and* that the requirement that the shechita immediately follow the semicha is D'Oraisa, then he should be allowed to enter the Azarah to do the semicha, because the Torah allows it!? **A: R' Ada bar Masna** said, it is allowed D'Oraisa. However, the **Rabanan** were goizer that he not walk into the Azarah as a gezeira to prevent him from taking any extra steps into the Azarah, because that would be assur and would carry kares. **A2: Others** say that **R' Ada bar Masna** said that the semicha of a metzora is required D'Oraisa, but the requirement that the shechita immediately follow the semicha is not D'Oraisa, and that is why he may not enter the Azarah.
 - **Q:** The Braisa quoted earlier said that a tamei may not do semicha. Now if the requirement that the shechita immediately follow the semicha is not D'Oraisa, why can't a tamei do semicha outside the Azarah and then have the animal brought inside for the shechita? **A:** Rather, the answer must have been that the semicha of a metzora is not required D'Oraisa, but the requirement that the shechita immediately follow the semicha is D'Oraisa.
 - **Ravina** said that **Reish Lakish** only said this ruling with regard to malkus, not kares.
 - **Ravin in the name of R' Avahu** said that **Reish Lakish's** ruling was said with regard to a tamei person who touched kodesh, as we learned elsewhere that if a tamei person touches kodesh, **Reish Lakish** says he gets malkus based on the lav of "b'chol kodesh lo

sigah” and **R’ Yochanan** says that he does not, because that pasuk is referring to terumah, not kodesh.

- **Q:** According to **Reish Lakish**, is that pasuk really available for this drasha? **Reish Lakish** himself uses this pasuk to teach a warning against a tamei person eating meat of kodashim!? **A:** From the fact that the pasuk uses verbiage of “sigah” (touching) it teaches a warning against touching. The warning against eating is taught from a hekesh between kodashim and entering the Beis Hamikdash – just as with regard to the entering it refers to an issur that carries kares, so too the kodashim refers to something that carries kares, which must be eating kodashim when tamei, because there is no kares for touching kodashim when tamei.
- There is a Braisa that says like **Reish Lakish**, that the pasuk of “b’chol kodesh lo sigah” is a warning against eating kodashim when a person is tamei, and it can’t refer to simply touching, because that would not carry kares, and the hekesh teaches that the pasuk is talking about something that has a chiyuv kares.
- **Q:** We learned that **Reish Lakish** uses this pasuk to teach a warning even against a tamei person eating kodashim ,even before the blood is offered. Now, in that case there is no kares. We see that the pasuk is not limited to something with a kares penalty!? **A:** The issur of a tamei person eating the kodashim before the blood is offered is learned from the words “b’chol kodesh”, but the main part of the pasuk refers only to something which carries a kares penalty.