



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

Zevachim Daf Mem Tes

- **Q:** How do we know that an asham must be shechted in the north? **A:** The pasuk says "bimkom asher yishchatu es ha'olah yishchatu es ha'asham".
 - **Q:** How do we know that the kabbalah of the asham must be done in the north? **A:** The pasuk continues and says "v'es damo yizrok", which teaches that the kabbalah must be done there as well.
 - **Q:** How do we know that the Kohen doing the kabbalah must also be in the north? **A:** The pasuk could have said "v'damo" and instead says "v'es damo". This teaches that the Kohen must be in the north as well.
 - **Q:** How do we know that this is absolutely essential? **A:** There is another pasuk regarding the asham of a metzora that says "v'shachat es hakeves" in the place of the chatas and olah. This repetition of the halacha teaches that it is absolutely essential.
 - **Q:** A Braisa uses this pasuk to teach the general rule that when something is part of a group and is then singled out for a special halacha it is no longer considered to be part of the group unless the Torah specifically puts it back as part of the group. If so, it is not available to teach that it is absolutely essential!? **A:** If that pasuk is needed for that, there would be no reason to write the first pasuk that gives the rule in general regarding ashamos that they must be shechted in the north (we would be able to learn it from the metzora's asham). The fact that it is written in both places proves that it is absolutely essential.
 - **Q:** This could be correct according to the view that when an item is removed from the group it cannot carry characteristics from the group but the group can still carry characteristics from it. However, according to the view that it can't learn from the group and visa-versa, both pesukim are needed and are not extra to teach that this is essential!? **A:** Since the Torah ultimately returns the metzora's asham to be part of the general group, it is considered to be returned in full, including for the north requirement. If so, the pasuk is extra and is available to teach that this requirement is essential.
 - **Q: Mar Zutra the son of R' Mari asked Ravina,** maybe it is only returned to the general group for purposes of it requiring blood applications and having its eimurim burned on the Mizbe'ach, but not for the requirement that the shechita take place in the north!? **A:** If so, the pasuk would have said "ki kachatas hu". The fact that it says "kachatas ha'asham" teaches that the metzora's asham should be like all other ashamos for all purposes.
 - **Q:** The pasuk of the metzora's asham compares it to a chatas and to an olah. Why does the Torah compare it to both of these? **A: Ravina** said, if it was only compared to a chatas, we would say that the north requirement of the chatas is itself learned from olah, and something that is learned via a hekesh can then teach via a hekesh as well. The pasuk teaches that it cannot.
 - **Q: Mar Zutra the son of R' Mari asked Ravina,** if so, let the pasuk simply compare it to an olah and not to a chatas!? **A:** If so, we would learn that something learned via a hekesh can then be used to teach via a hekesh and the reason why the Torah didn't just compare it to a chatas was because the Torah preferred to make a hekesh with the true source of the halacha. Therefore, the pasuk compared it to chatas and then olah, to teach that something that is learned via a hekesh cannot teach through a hekesh.

- **Rava** said, this rule (that something learned via a hekesh cannot then teach via a hekesh) is learned from the pasuk “kasher yuram mishor zevach hashelamim”. Why does the pasuk compare the Kohen Gadol’s par to a shelamim? It can’t be to teach that its diaphragm and kidneys are offered, because the pasuk specifies that!? Rather, we learn this halacha from the Kohen Gadol’s par to the par helam davar, and from the par helam davar to the chatas for the sin of avoda zara. Now, that would be something learned from a hekesh then being used to teach via a hekesh. To prevent that from taking place, the pasuk says the extra phrase of “kasher yuram mishor zevach hashelamim”, which makes it as if this halacha is actually written by the par helam davar, and therefore it is no longer considered to be learned from a hekesh.
 - **Q: R’ Pappa** asked **Rava**, if the Torah was trying to teach this, why didn’t the Torah just actually write the requirement to offer the diaphragm and the kidneys by the par helam davar!? **A:** If the Torah would have done so, we would have said that in truth something learned from a hekesh can then be used to teach via a hekesh and the reason the Torah wrote these requirements explicitly by par helam davar was because it chose to do so, but not that it had to just to allow a hekesh to be made to the chatas for the sin of avoda zara. The Torah therefore wrote the extra phrase which we now see was only written to teach that something learned via a hekesh cannot be used to then teach via a hekesh.
- We have now established that something learned via a hekesh cannot be used to then teach via a hekesh.
 - **Q:** Can something that was learned via a hekesh then teach via a gezeira shava? **A:** There is a halacha regarding tzaraas that is learned via a hekesh and a Braisa then teaches that further via a gezeira shava. We see that this may be done!
 - **R’ Yochanan** said, although this is allowed in all other areas of the Torah, this is no proof that this may be done regarding kodashim. This can be proven from the fact that if this was allowed to be done for kodashim, the Torah should not have taught the north requirement regarding ashamei, and we could have learned it from chatas via a gezeira shava! The fact that it does not do so, shows that this is not allowed by kodashim.
 - Something that is learned from a hekesh can then teach through a kal v’chomer. We have learned this earlier from a Braisa taught by the yeshiva of **R’ Yishmael**.
 - **Q:** Can something that was learned via a hekesh then teach via a “binyan av”? **A: R’ Yirmiya** said, if this was allowed, there would be no reason to write the north requirement regarding an ashamei because we could learn it from a binyan av from chatas. The reason that the Torah wrote it by ashamei must be because something that was learned via a hekesh cannot then teach via a “binyan av”.
 - **Q:** According to you, why don’t we learn out ashamei from a binyan av from olah? The reason is that we would say that olah is different because it is totally burned on the Mizbe’ach. Similarly, the reason we could not learn ashamei with a binyan av from chatas may be because chatas is different, because it brings a kapparah for aveiros that carry kares!? Therefore, there is no proof that we cannot darshen in this way.
 - **Q:** We see that we could not learn out one of these korbanos from any other. What about learning out one from the other two with a tzad hashava? **A:** We could not learn olah from chatas and ashamei, because they are different in that they bring a kapparah. We could not learn chatas from olah and ashamei, because they are different in that they are brought from male animals. We could also not learn ashamei from olah and chatas, because they are brought by the tzibbur as well.