



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

### Zevachim Daf Mem Gimmel

#### MISHNA

- The following are things for which a person would not be chayuv kares for eating them even though they are from a korban of piggul: the kometz, ketores, levonah, the mincha of a Kohen, the mincha of the Kohen Gadol, blood, and nesachim that are brought on their own. This is the view of **R' Meir**. The **Chachomim** say, even the nesachim that come along with an animal.
  - With regard to the log of oil of a metzora, **R' Shimon** says he is not chayuv kares if it is piggul and **R' Meir** says he is, because the blood of the metzora's asham makes it mutar and anything that has a matir – either for people or for the Mizbe'ach – would make one chayuv for piggul with kares.
  - With regard to an olah, its blood is a matir for its meat to be offered on the Mizbe'ach and for its hide to go to the Kohanim.
  - With regard to a bird olah, its blood is a matir for its meat to be offered on the Mizbe'ach.
  - With regard to a bird chatas, its blood is a matir for its meat to be eaten by the Kohanim.
  - With regard to the korbanos offered on the inner Mizbe'ach (which are then burned outside) its blood is matir the eimurim to be offered on the Mizbe'ach.
    - **R' Shimon** says, any korban that is not offered on the outside Mizbe'ach like a shelamim, would not make one chayuv for it for piggul.

#### GEMARA

- **Ulla** said, if a kometz of a mincha that was piggul is then offered on the Mizbe'ach, the piggul status leaves it. If the burning of the kometz can make other things into piggul, then the burning of the piggul is certainly effective for itself.
  - The Gemara explains the statement to mean, if the kometz is not accepted because it is piggul, how can it cause other things to become piggul!? Rather, it must be that it is accepted on the Mizbe'ach.
  - **Q:** What is **Ulla** teaching? It can't be that he is teaching that one is not chayuv for eating the kometz of piggul, because that is taught in our Mishna! It can't be that he is teaching that if it is brought up onto the Mizbe'ach it is not taken off, because another Mishna already teaches this halacha! He can't be teaching that even if it was then taken down we bring it back up, because a Mishna says that if it was taken down it is *not* taken back up!? **A:** **Ulla** is teaching that in a case where the fire took hold of the kometz and the kometz was then taken down, it is brought back up.
    - **Q:** **Ulla** already says this elsewhere regarding passul eimurim, that it is only not brought back up if the fire has not yet taken hold of it, but if it did, it is not brought back up!? **A:** We would have thought that this only applies to a limb, which is one solid piece. But, a kometz falls apart and is therefore different.
    - **R' Achai** said, if part of a piggul kometz was taken up and the fire took hold of it, we would then bring the rest of it up as well, even l'chatchila.
- **R' Yitzchak in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if piggul, nossar, or tamei is brought up onto the Mizbe'ach, the issur is removed from them.
  - **Q:** **R' Chisda** asked, is the Mizbe'ach a mikvah!? **A:** **R' Zeira** said, the case is that the fire took hold of them.
    - **Q:** **R' Yitzchak bar Bisna** asked, a Braisa says that the **Others** learn from the pasuk of "v'tumaso alav" that this refers to the person being tamei, rather than the meat, since it refers to something from which the tumah can be removed.

Now, according to what was just said, the tumah can be removed from the meat as well!? **A: Rava** said, the **Others** are referring specifically to tumah that can be removed through a mikvah.

- **Q:** They make no mention of a mikvah!? **A:** Rather, **R' Pappa** said, the **Others** say the pasuk is referring to one who ate meat of a shelamim, whose meat is not offered on the Mizbe'ach and therefore cannot have its tumah leave it. **Ravina** said, "v'tumaso alav" refers to something whose tumah can be removed while the thing is whole. This clearly refers to the person, and not the meat.
- The Braisa (that was just quoted) says, we would not know if kares comes for eating the meat when the meat is tamei or when the person is tamei. Therefore, we have a gezeira shava from one who is tamei and enters the Mikdash, that it is referring to the person who is tamei. **R' Yose** says, since "kodashim" in the pasuk is written in the plural and tumah is written in the singular, it must refer to the person. **Rebbi** says, the word "v'achal" teaches that it refers to the person who is tamei. **Others** say, that the pasuk of "v'tumaso alav" refers to the person being tamei, rather than the meat, since it refers to something from which the tumah can be removed.
  - **Rava** explained the drasha of **Rebbi** by saying that any pasuk not explained by **R' Yitzchak bar Avudimi** and any Braisa not explained by **Ze'iri** is not considered to be fully explained. He then quoted **R' Yitzchak bar Avudimi** who says that the pasuk begins using the feminine form, switches to the masculine, and then switches back to the feminine. This teaches that the pasuk is discussing where the person is tamei.
    - The Gemara then quotes the Braisa which caused **Rava** to say that any Braisa not explained by **Ze'iri** is not considered to be fully explained.