



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

Zevachim Daf Lamed Daled

- A Braisa (partially quoted above) says, if a tamei person ate from the meat of a korbon before the zrika, **Reish Lakish** says he gets malkus and **R' Yochanan** says he does not.
 - **Abaye** said, the machlokes is only in regard to where the person is tamei, but if the meat was tamei and the person was tahor all would agree that he would get malkus even if he ate it before the zrika. We see this from the fact that the pasuk of "v'habasar" is darshened to teach that even wood or levonah, which are not edible, that become tamei and are then eaten are assur and carry malkus. If they are assur with malkus, then certainly eating tamei meat before the zrika, which is edible, is assur with malkus. **Rava** said, the machlokes is only in regard to where the person is tamei, but if the meat was tamei and the person was tahor all would agree that he would not get malkus if he ate it before the zrika. He said that we learn this from a hekesh of a tamei person getting malkus for eating kodesh meat – which only applies after the zrika – to a tahor person eating tamei meat – which therefore also only applies after the zrika.
 - **Q:** How will **Rava** explain **Abaye's** proof? **A:** He will say that one only gets malkus for eating tamei wood or levonah of kodesh if they were placed into a kli shareis, because doing so gives them the status as if the zrika was done for them (these items don't have an associated zrika, and this acts as their "permitter"). We see this concept in a Mishna.
- If a person offers up the limbs of a non-kosher animal on the Mizbe'ach, **Reish Lakish** says he gets malkus and **R' Yochanan** says he does not. **Reish Lakish** says, that the fact that the Torah says a kosher animal may be offered teaches that a non-kosher animal may not be offered, and a lav that is learned from an assei carries the malkus penalty. **R' Yochanan** says, that such a lav does not carry the malkus penalty.
 - **Q:** **R' Yirmiya** asked, a Braisa says there is no malkus for eating a non-kosher animal, because it is a lav that is learned from an assei, and therefore does not carry malkus. This contradicts **Reish Lakish**!? **A:** **R' Yaakov** said to **R' Yirmiya bar Tachlifa**, with regard to one who offers the limbs of a non-kosher animal on the Mizbe'ach all would agree that he does not get malkus. The machlokes is regarding one who offers the limbs of a kosher "chaya" on the Mizbe'ach – **R' Yochanan** says he has violated an assei, because the Torah says one can offer a "beheima" which teaches that he may not offer a chaya, and **Reish Lakish** says he has not violated anything, because the teaching to offer a beheima is only to teach that that is preferable.
 - **Q:** **Rava** asked, a Braisa darshens psukim and clearly says that an offering of a chaya as a korbon is passul! This is a **TEYUFTA** of **Reish Lakish**!

V'KULAN SHEKIBLU...

- **Q:** **Reish Lakish** asked **R' Yochanan**, if a passul person did kabbalah and zrika, does that also make any remaining lifeblood in the animal passul as well, or may a valid Kohen go and do a kabbalah and zrika with other lifeblood from the animal and make the korbon valid? **A:** **R' Yochanan** said, the only zrika that makes the remaining lifeblood passul is a zrika with intent for beyond its time or place, because the zrika in that case makes the korbon into piggul.
 - **R' Zvid** said that **Reish Lakish** asked, if a Kohen throws a cup of passul blood does it make the remaining lifeblood passul? **R' Yochanan** answered, from your question it must be that you know the halacha if a passul Kohen does the zrika, whether that makes the remaining lifeblood passul. If the passul Kohen makes it passul, the cup of passul blood would also make it passul, and if the passul Kohen does not, then the cup of passul blood would also not make it passul.

- **R' Yirmiya MiDifti** said that **Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, if the Kohen was mekabel the blood in two cups and one was used for zrika, is the blood in the remaining cup considered to be rejected and should therefore be spilled out, or is it considered to be "shirayim" in which case it should be poured onto the base of the Mizbe'ach? **Rabbah** said, this is the subject of a machlokes between **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** and the **Rabanan** in a Braisa, where the **Rabanan** say that the blood in the other cup is spilled out and **R' Elazar** says it is poured on the base of the Mizbe'ach.

KIBEIL HAKASHER V'NOSSAN LAPASSUL...

- The Mishna gave 3 examples – 1) if a valid Kohen did the kabbalah and then gave the blood to a passul, he should then give it back to the valid person who can then continue with the avodah; 2) if he did the kabbalah with his right hand and then transferred it to his left hand, he should give it back to his right hand; and 3) if he did the kabbalah in a kli shareis and then transferred it to a regular keili, he should put it back into a kli shareis. The Gemara says that all 3 examples are needed. If we only had the case of the passul we would say it is referring to a Kohen who is tamei and the reason he doesn't make it passul by holding it is because a tamei is valid for the avodah of the tzibbur, but other types of pessulim make it passul. If we only had the case of the left hand we would say, that case is valid because there is part of an avodah on Yom Kippur that is done with the left hand, but the case of the regular keili should be passul. If we only had the case of the regular keili we would say, that case is valid because the keili is fit to become a kli shareis. This is why all 3 examples are necessary.
- **Q:** Why don't we say that the blood becomes rejected in these cases? **A:** **Ravina** said to **R' Ashi** that **R' Yirmiya MiDifti in the name of Rava** said the Mishna follows the view of **Chanan HaMitzri**, who does not hold of the concept of rejection. **A2:** **R' Ashi** said, it may be that the Mishna holds of the concept of rejection. However, anything that becomes passul, but is within one's power to change (the passul can give it back to the valid Kohen, it can be moved from the left hand back to the right, etc.), does not cause it to become rejected.
 - **R' Shaya** said, the answer of **R' Ashi** seems correct. We find in a Mishna where **R' Yehuda** holds of the concept of rejection, and we find in a Braisa where **R' Yehuda** holds that on Erev Pesach the Kohen takes a cup of blood from the floor and throws it on the Mizbe'ach. This shows that he holds that something that becomes passul, but is within one's power to change, does not cause it to become rejected.