



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

### Zevachim Daf Mem Ches

PAR V'SA'IR SHEL YOM HAKIPPURIM...

- **Q:** The requirement of shechita to be done in the north is written regarding an olah. If so, why is it that the Mishna begins teaching the requirement by listing the chataos? **A:** Since chatas is learned via a drasha it is considered more beloved to the Tanna, and that is why he discusses it first.
  - **Q:** Why doesn't the Tanna first discuss the case of the outside chataos, since that is where the drasha is learned!? **A:** Since the blood of the Yom Kippur korbanos have their blood brought into the Kodosh Hakodashim, they are more beloved to the Tanna, and that is why he begins with discussing them.
- **Q:** Where is it written that the olah must be shechted in the north? **A:** The pasuk says "v'shachat oso ahl yerech haMizbe'ach tzafonah".
  - **Q:** The preceding pasuk says this is referring to an olah brought from sheep or goats. How do we know that this applies to an olah brought from cattle as well? **A:** The pasuk begins with the word "v'ihm", with the conjunctive "vuv" creating a hekesh to the earlier parsha which discusses a cattle olah. This teaches that an olah brought from cattle must also be shechted in the north.
    - **Q:** What about according to the view from a Braisa that a previous parsha cannot learn from a later parsha? The Braisa says that **R' Akiva** says that the "v'ihm nefesh" in the parsha of ashram taluy connects it to the previous parsha of ashram me'ilah and teaches that an ashram taluy is also brought for a case of safek me'ilah. The **Chachomim** argue and say a person is patur for safek me'ilah. Presumably, the machlokes is that **R' Akiva** says we learn a previous parsha from a later parsha and the **Rabanan** say that we don't!? **A:** **R' Pappa** said, that all agree that we do learn an earlier parsha from a later one. The reason the **Rabanan** hold that an ashram taluy is not brought for a safek me'ilah is because there is a gezeira shava on the word "mitzvos" between ashram taluy and a regular chatas, which teaches that an ashram taluy is only brought for an aveira which requires a chatas when done b'shogeg and has a chiyuv kares when done b'meized. This excludes me'ilah, which does not carry a chiyuv kares. **R' Akiva** darshens the gezeira shava to teach that an ashram taluy is only brought for an aveira which requires the bringing of a fixed chatas. The **Rabanan** disagree with that, because they say that a gezeira shava must be taken all the way, and cannot stop less than learning the full comparison. Although **R' Akiva** also agrees to that, he says that the "vuv" creates a hekesh which teaches that there is an ashram taluy for safek me'ilah, even though the gezeira shava would seem to teach differently.
      - **Q:** Maybe the machlokes is that when we are faced with a conflicting gezeira shava and hekesh, **R' Akiva** says we follow the hekesh and the **Rabanan** say we follow the gezeira shava? **A:** All agree that we follow the hekesh. However, they say that this hekesh is not to teach the upper parsha from the lower parsha, rather it is to teach the lower parsha from the upper parsha – that the ashram taluy must have a value of at least 2 silver shekels, just like the ashram of me'ilah. This is needed so that we not think that an ashram taluy can be worth even a smaller amount, since the chatas for that same aveira could be worth any amount. **R' Akiva** (who uses the hekesh for his drasha) will learn this

halacha from the pasuk of “v’zos Toras ha’asham”, which teaches that there is one set of rules for all ashamos.

- **Q:** This makes sense only according to the view that “Toras” is to be understood in this way, but according to the other view, from where would **R’ Akiva** know that an asham taluy must be worth at least 2 silver shekels? **A:** He learns it from a gezeira shava of “b’erkicha”. For the asham shifcha charufa, where this word is not written, he will learn it from a gezeira shava on the word “b’eil”.
- **Q:** How do we know that a chatas must be shechted in the north? **A:** The pasuk says “v’shachat es hachatas bimkom ha’olah”.
  - **Q:** How do we know that the kabbalah must also be done in the north? **A:** The immediately following pasuk begins with “v’lakach (which we learn refers to the kabbalah) haKohen midamah”, which can be read as saying that this too must be done in the place of the olah.
  - **Q:** How do we know that the Kohen doing the kabbalah must be in the north as well? **A:** The word “v’lakach” can be read as saying “lo yikach” – he should take himself (and stand in the north).
  - **Q:** How do we know that the requirement to shecht it in the north is essential, and it is passul if it is shechted elsewhere? **A:** There are other pesukim regarding the various types of chatas, and the multiple pesukim teach that it is absolutely essential.
  - **Q:** The word “oso” in the pasuk of “v’shachat oso bimkom asher yishchat es ha’olah” is an exclusionary term, so what does it come to exclude? **A:** It is needed as darshened in a Braisa, which says that the pasuk teaches that only it – the Nasi’s chatas discussed in the pasuk – needs to be shechted in the north, but the chatas of Nachshon (the chatas brought by the Nesi’im at the time that the Mishkan was inaugurated) need not be shechted in the north. We would have thought that since **R’ Yehuda** says this chatas needed semicha, it needed the north as well. That is why “oso” is needed to teach that it did not have to be shechted in the north.
    - **Q:** What about according to **R’ Shimon** who says it did not need semicha? **Mar Zutra the son of R’ Tavi** said to **Ravina**, even according to **R’ Yehuda** you can’t say that we would have thought that since it was included for semicha it should be included for the north, because we would not learn this one time korbon from other korbanos that are brought for generations. Therefore, “oso” is not needed to exclude the north requirement of the chatas of Nachshon!? **A:** Rather, “oso” teaches that the animal must be in the north when it is shechted, but the shochet need not be standing in the north.
  - **Q:** This halacha is learned in a Braisa from the “oso” of a different pasuk, so the “oso” written regarding the Nasi’s chatas is not needed for this!? **A:** Rather, it teaches that the shechita of the animal needs to take place in the north, but the melika done to a bird korbon need not be done in the north. A Braisa says, we would think that if shechita, which can be done without a Kohen, needs to be done in the north, then melika, which must be done by a Kohen, must certainly be done in the north. That is why we need “oso” to teach that melika does not need to be done in the north.
    - **Q:** Maybe the reason shechita of an animal must be done in the north is that the shechita must be done with a kli, but Melika, which is done with the Kohen’s hand would never even be thought to need the north, so why do we need “oso”? **A:** Rather, “oso” teaches that the Nasi’s chatas must be in the north, but the Korbon Pesach need not be shechted in the north. A Braisa says, we would think that if shechita of an olah, which has no set time, must be done in the north, then shechita of a Pesach, which has a set time, must surely be done in the north. That is why we need “oso” to teach that it need not be done in the north.

- **Q:** Maybe the reason an olah must be shechted in the north is because it is totally burned on the Mizbe'ach, but there would be no reason to think that a Pesach should need to be shechted in the north!? **A:** We could make this same kal v'chomer from a chatas, which is not totally burned.
- **Q:** Maybe a chatas needs the north because it brings a kapparah for aveiros that carry a chiyuv kares? **A:** We could make this same kal v'chomer from an asham, which does not bring a kapparah for a chiyuv kares.
- **Q:** Maybe an asham (and all these others) need the north because they are kodshei kodashim, but a Pesach, which is not, would not need the north? So why is "oso" needed? **A:** "Oso" comes to teach as we initially said – the animal must be shechted in the north, but the shochet need not be standing in the north. Although we asked that this is already learned in a Braisa from a different pasuk, we will say that the reason we learn it twice is to teach that although the shochet need not be in the north during the shechita, the Kohen who is doing the kabbalah does need to be in the north when he does the kabbalah.
  - **Q:** This is already known from "v'lakach", as stated above!? **A:** He does not darshen in this way, and therefore needs the "oso" to teach this.
- **Q:** We now have a source that shechita and kabbalah of an olah must be done in the north. How do we know that this is absolutely essential and that the korbon will be passul if they are not done in the north? **A:** **R' Ada bar Ahava** (or **Rabbah bar Shila**) said, we have a kal v'chomer – if a chatas, whose north requirement is only known from an olah, and yet the north requirement is absolutely essential, then the north requirement of an olah itself is surely absolutely essential!
  - **Q:** We can ask that a chatas is different, because it brings a kapparah for aveiros that have a chiyuv kares!? **A:** **Ravina** said, this is what **R' Ada bar Ahava** was asking – we never find that the secondary thing is more stringent than the primary thing, so the north requirement of chatas (which is learned out from olah) cannot be more stringent than the north requirement of olah!
    - **Q:** **Mar Zutra the son of R' Mari** asked **Ravina**, do we never find that the secondary thing in a kal v'chomer is more stringent than the primary one? The halacha is that maaser sheini may be redeemed, but food purchased with money used to redeem maaser sheini may not be redeemed!? **A:** The case of maaser sheini is different. The reason it can't be redeemed is because the kedusha that it gets is not strong enough to allow a redemption to take effect.
      - **Q:** The halacha is that one cannot place physical kedusha onto an animal that has a permanent mum, and yet one can put the physical kedusha of temurah onto an animal that has a mum!? **A:** The case of temurah is different. New kedusha comes from chullin, and such kedusha is not strong enough to be effective on a baal mum. When doing temurah, the kedusha is coming from something that is already kadosh. Such kedusha is stronger and can therefore even be effective on a baal mum.
      - **Q:** The halacha is that a Korbon Pesach does not need semicha, nesachim, or tenufah, and yet if it is leftover after Pesach (not having been used for a Korbon Pesach) and is then brought as a korbon it does need semicha, nesachim, and tenufah!? **A:** When it is brought at any time other than Erev Pesach it is actually a shelamim. That is why it has these other requirements.

- We can also say that we know that the north requirement of an olah is absolutely essential based on the word “ha’olah”, which we understand to mean that the olah must always be done in its proper place. If not, it is passul.