



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

Zevachim Daf Nun Ches

PEREK KODSHEI KODASHIM -- PEREK SHISHI

MISHNA

- With regard to kodshei kodashim that were shechted on the Mizbe'ach, **R' Yose** says it is as if they were shechted in the north, and **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says, from the middle of the Mizbe'ach and south it is considered to be in the south and from the middle of the Mizbe'ach and north it is considered to be in the north.

GEMARA

- **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, **R' Yose** would say that the entire Mizbe'ach was situated in the north of the Azarah. If so, why does he say that shechting on it is "like" shechting in the north? We would have thought to say that the pasuk says the shechita should be "ahl yerech" (at the side) of the Mizbe'ach, which should exclude on the Mizbe'ach itself. He therefore teaches that shechting on the Mizbe'ach is like shechting in the north and is valid.
 - **Q: R' Zeira** asked **R' Assi**, you are suggesting (by saying that the machlokes in the Mishna is based on where the Mizbe'ach was located) that **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** holds that the Mizbe'ach was situated half in the north of the Azarah and half in the south. However, that can't be, because you have said in the name of **R' Yochanan** that **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** would agree that if the korbon was shechted on the ground opposite the Mizbe'ach, the shechita would be passul (which suggests that the entire Mizbe'ach was situated in the south)!? **A: R' Assi** said, **R' Yochanan** has said that **R' Yose and R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** argue in how to darshen a pasuk. The pasuk regarding the outside Mizbe'ach says "v'zavachta alav es olosecha v'es shilamecha". **R' Yose** darshens this to mean that the entire Mizbe'ach is fit for the shechita of an olah and of a shelamim. **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** darshens this to mean that half is fit even for the shechita of an olah and the other half is fit only for the shechita of a shelamim, because if the entire Mizbe'ach is fit for the shechita of an olah, why would the pasuk even need to mention that it is fit for the shechita of a shelamim!? **R' Yose** holds that if the pasuk only mentioned olah we would say that only an olah may be shechted on the Mizbe'ach, since its restriction to be shechted in the north leaves it limited space in which to do so. However, a shelamim, which can be shechted anywhere in the Azarah, may not be shechted on the Mizbe'ach. That is why the pasuk had to mention olah and mention shelamim.
 - **Q: R' Acha MiDifti** said to **Ravina**, what did **R' Yochanan** mean that **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** would agree that if the korbon was shechted on the ground opposite the Mizbe'ach, the shechita would be passul? If can't refer to one who shechts on the base or on the ledge, because that is part of the Mizbe'ach!? It can't refer to where tunnels were dug under the Mizbe'ach and he shechted there, because a Braisa darshens a pasuk to teach that the Mizbe'ach must be attached to the ground, and cannot be situated above tunnels or on arches!? **A:** The case would be where they made the Mizbe'ach smaller, and a person then shechted on the area where the Mizbe'ach once stood.
 - **R' Zeira** said, it is not possible that **R' Yochanan** taught that **R' Yose** holds that the entire Mizbe'ach was in the north, and yet there is no mention of this in any Mishna! He then searched and found a Mishna. The Mishna says that the fire on the Mizbe'ach from which the coals for the burning of the ketores were taken had to be 4 amos north from the southwest corner of the Mizbe'ach. Now, it must be that **R' Yose** is the Tanna of this

Mishna. A Braisa says that **R' Yose** says, anything that is taken from within the Heichal to be put on the outside Mizbe'ach, for example the levonah that was taken from the Shulchan on Shabbos and burned on the outside Mizbe'ach, must be placed on that Mizbe'ach at the closest point to the entrance to the Heichal. Similarly, anything taken from the outside Mizbe'ach to be used inside the Heichal, for example the coals from the outside Mizbe'ach which were to be brought inside for burning of the ketores, must be taken from the Mizbe'ach at the closest point to the entrance of the Heichal. Now, based on this, what is **R' Yose's** view of the placement of the Mizbe'ach? It can't be that he holds that the entire Mizbe'ach was in the south, because then the closest point to the entrance of the Heichal would be 27 amos north from the southwest corner of the Mizbe'ach! Even if he holds that it would suffice to get it near the entrance of the Ulam (which was 10 amos wider than the entrance of the Heichal – 5 to the north and 5 to the south), he would still need to put the fire 22 amos from the southwest corner!? It can't be that he holds that half the Mizbe'ach was in the north and half was in the south, because to reach the point near the entrance of the Heichal he would have to put the fire 11 amos off the southwest corner!? Even if he holds that it would suffice to put it near the entrance of the Ulam, he would still need to put the fire 6 amos from the corner!? Rather, it must be that he holds that the entire Mizbe'ach was in the north of the Azarah. Therefore, the southwest corner of the Mizbe'ach was actually at the opening of the Heichal. The reason the fire had to be put 4 amos north was to allow for the amah of the base, the amah of the ledge, the amah of the horn, and an amah of space for the Kohanim to walk. Had it been moved north any more it would have no longer been at the entrance to the Heichal. We see from this Mishna that the view of **R' Yose** is as **R' Yochanan** said, that he holds that the entire Mizbe'ach was in the north of the Azarah.

- **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, this Mishna is no proof to the view of **R' Yose**, because the Mishna may follow the view of **R' Yehuda**, who says that the Mizbe'ach was placed in the middle of the Azarah, with its middle 10 amos (the Mizbe'ach was 32x32 amos) facing the entrance to the Heichal.
 - **Q:** How could the Mishna follow the view of **R' Yehuda**? According to him the fire would have to be put 11 amos north of the southwest corner in order for it to be near the opening of the Heichal!? Even if he holds that it would suffice to put it near the entrance of the Ulam, he would still need to put the fire 6 amos from the corner!? **A:** He holds that it only needs to be at the entrance of the Ulam. When the Mishna says it needs to be 4 amos to the north, it means *besides* the amah needed for the base and the amah needed for the ledge. When taking those into account, the fire is to be placed 6 amos from the corner, which gets it to the entrance of the Ulam.
 - **Q:** Why don't we say that the Mishna follows **R' Yose** and that he holds that the Mizbe'ach was in the center? **A:** We know that **R' Yehuda** holds the view that it is situated in the center.
- **R' Shrivya** said, the Mishna is not a proof to the view of **R' Yose**, because the Mishna may follow the view of **R' Yose Haglili**, who darshens pesukim and says that the kiyor had to be in the area between the Mizbe'ach and the Heichal, but to the south of the Mizbe'ach. The only reason he would have to say that it must be south of the Mizbe'ach would be if he holds that the entire Mizbe'ach was in the north, and he holds that the pasuk teaches that no keilim (including the kiyor) may be in the north. That is why it must be to the south.
 - The view that argues on **R' Yose Haglili** is the view of **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov**, who darshens the pasuk to teach that no keilim – including the Mizbe'ach – may be in the north of the Azarah.