



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

### Zevachim Daf Mem Vuv

CHUTZ MIN HADAM...

- **Q:** How do we know that blood of a korban is not subject to nossar and tumah? **A:** With regard to me'ilah (which the Gemara will then connect to nossar and tamei) we have learned that blood is not subject to me'ilah. How do we know this? **Ulla** said, the pasuk regarding the korban blood says "lachem". This teaches that "it is yours", and there is no me'ilah. **The Yeshiva of R' Shimon** taught, the pasuk says "l'chaper". The blood was given for use to achieve a kappara, not for me'ilah. **R' Yochanan** said, the pasuk says "hu", which teaches that the blood has the same status before the kapparah as it has after the kapparah (no me'ilah).
  - **Q:** Maybe we should compare the blood after the kappara to the blood before the kapparah and say that me'ilah does apply? **A:** That can't be, because we never find something that already had its mitzvah done, that is still subject to me'ilah.
    - **Q:** Terumas Hadeshen is subject to me'ilah even after the mitzvah is done!? **A:** Terumas Hadeshen and the bigdei kehunah are 2 pesukim that teach that me'ilah applies even after the mitzvah is done. When 2 pesukim teach the same thing, we can't use that to teach to elsewhere.
    - **Q:** That answer works according to the **Rabanan**, who say that the pasuk by bigdei kehuna teaches that me'ilah applies after the mitzvah is done. However, according to **R' Dosa**, who uses the pasuk for a different drasha, why can't we learn from terumas hadeshen that me'ilah applies even after a mitzvah is done? **A:** The pasuk regarding eglah arufah also teaches that me'ilah applies there after the mitzvah is done, so there are still 2 pesukim that teach this concept, which means that it should not be applied elsewhere.
    - **Q:** There is a shita that says that we can apply something taught by 2 pesukim to other places as well. According to him, why can't we say that me'ilah applies after the mitzvah is done? **A:** The pesukim of terumas hadeshen and eglah arufah have exclusionary words ("samo" and ha'arufah"), which teach that this is not to be applied elsewhere.
  - **Q:** Why do we need 3 pesukim to exclude the blood from me'ilah? **A:** One pasuk excludes the blood from the halachos of nossar, one excludes it from the halachos of me'ilah, and one excludes it from the halachos of tumah (if a tamei person eats the blood he would not be chayuv for eating tamei kodashim).
    - A pasuk is not needed to exclude the blood from piggul, because piggul only applies to a part of the korban that becomes mutar through some other process (e.g. the meat becomes mutar through the zerika of the blood). Blood is itself the permitting process, and is therefore not subject to piggul.
- **R' Yochanan** asked, there are 3 pesukim that teach that a tamei person who eats a shelamim is chayuv kares. Why do we need 3 pesukim? One is to teach regarding the general category of all kodashim, one is to teach specifically regarding shelamim (from which we learn that only kodashim that are brought on the Mizbe'ach, like a shelamim, are subject to this chiyuv kares), and one is to teach that a tamei person who eats inedible kodashim (the wood, the levonah, and the ketores) is also chayuv kares. According to **R' Shimon** (who says that a tamei person is not chayuv kares for eating these inedible things) it is needed to teach a chiyuv kares for eating a chatas that is offered on the inside Mizbe'ach. We would think that just as **R' Shimon** says that these inside korbanos are not subject to piggul, because they are not offered on the outside Mizbe'ach like a shelamim, maybe they are also not subject to kares for eating while tamei. The pasuk therefore teaches that they are.

- We have learned, there was a machlokes between **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** and a machlokes between **R' Elazar and R' Yose the son of R' Chanina**. One from each set held that the machlokes between the **T"K and R' Shimon** would only be where someone ate an inedible item that itself is tamei, but where only the person was tamei all would agree that there would not be malkus. The other one from each set held that the machlokes is even when it is the person who was tamei and the **T"K** holds that even then he would get malkus. This is based on a hekesh between the pesukim of eating the kodesh when it is tamei (for which there would be malkus even for inedible items) to the next pasuk of a tamei person who eats kodesh. This is **R' Tavyumei's** version of the above.
  - **R' Kahana's** version was that the machlokes of "one from each set" was regarding the view of **R' Shimon**. One from each set held that the machlokes between the **T"K and R' Shimon** would only be where someone who was tamei ate an inedible item of kodesh, but where the item itself was tamei all would agree that there would be malkus. The other one from each set held that the machlokes is even when it is the item itself that was tamei and **R' Shimon** holds that even then he would not get malkus.
    - **Rava** said, it is logical to say that the machlokes is the same in both cases, because if in this case he is not included in the pasuk of eating when he is tamei, he should also not be included in the pasuk of eating kodesh when it is tamei.
      - **Q:** We have learned that "v'habasar" comes to include the eating of wood and levonah in the halacha of eating tamei kodashim!? **A:** The pasuk teaches that inedible items that are tamei are passul to be used, but it does not teach that one would get malkus for eating them.

#### MISHNA

- A korbon should be shechted for the sake of six things: for the sake of the korbon that it is, for the sake of the one bringing the korbon, for the sake of Hashem, for the sake of the fires ("ishim"), for the sake of the "rei'ach", and for the sake of pleasing Hashem ("nicho'ach"). The chatas and the asham should also be shechted for the sake of the aveira for which they are being brought.
  - **R' Yose** said, even if the person shechted without having in mind for the sake of any of these things, it is still a valid korbon, for it is a stipulation of Beis Din that a korbon be brought without any specific intent, because the intent is determined only by the one who does the avodah (not by the owner).

#### GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** darshened the pasuk as follows: the word "olah" teaches that the korbon should be offered for its sake (an olah for the sake of an olah), the word "ishim" teaches that it should be offered for the sake of being offered onto the fires of the Mizbe'ach and totally burned and not to just be roasted, the word "rei'ach" teaches that it should be offered for the sake of giving off a smell which excludes the Kohen roasting the limbs and then bringing them up onto the Mizbe'ach, the word "nicho'ach" teaches that it should be offered for the sake of pleasing Hashem, and the word "LaHashem" teaches that it should be offered for the sake of Hashem.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, a chatas that was shechted for the sake of an olah is passul, but if it was shechted for the sake of chullin it is valid.
  - **R' Elazar** said, **Rav's** view is based on the pasuk of "v'lo yichalilu es kadshei Bnei Yisrael", which teaches that kodashim profane kodashim, but chullin does not.
  - **Q: Rabbah** asked, in our Mishna **R' Yose** says the korbon is valid if brought without any intent. This suggests that if it is brought with chullin intent it would be passul!? **A: Abaye** said, it may be that **R' Yose** meant that if he has no intent at all the korbon is valid and is even accepted for the owner, but if he has intent for chullin it is valid but is not accepted for the owner.
- **R' Elazar** said, a chatas that was shechted for the sake of chullin is valid, but if a chatas is shechted on the assumption that it was chullin, it is passul (because he doesn't even realize that he is shechting kodashim).

- This is like **Shmuel** asked **R' Huna** – how do we know that when someone shechted kodashim without realizing it is kodashim, it is passul? **R' Huna** said, the pasuk says “V'shachat es ben habakar lifnei Hashem”, which teaches that the shechita must be done when he is aware that it is a korbon. **Shmuel** said, I knew that, but I want to know how we know that this is absolutely essential. **R' Huna** said, we learn this from the pasuk of “lirtzonchem tizbachuhu”, which teaches that it should be shechted with an awareness that it is a korbon.