



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

Zevachim Daf Samach

- The Gemara continues with the machlokes between **R' Yehuda** and **R' Yose**.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yehuda** the pasuk makes sense when it says that Shlomo was "mekadesh" the floor, because he had to do so to allow the korbanos to be burned on it. However, according to **R' Yose** why did he have to be "mekadesh" it? **A:** He had to make it kadosh so that the new, larger Mizbe'ach could be placed there.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yose** it makes sense when the pasuk says that the "copper Mizbe'ach" was too small, since it was only the Mizbe'ach of Moshe that was too small. However, according to **R' Yehuda** it was not only the copper Mizbe'ach that was too small – rather the stone Mizbe'ach of Shlomo was also too small!? **A:** The stone Mizbe'ach replaced the copper Mizbe'ach of Moshe and was therefore referred to as the copper Mizbe'ach, and the pasuk therefore means that this stone Mizbe'ach was too small for all the korbanos.
 - **Q:** What is the basis of the machlokes (**R' Yehuda** darshens the gezeira shava from the Mizbe'ach of Yechezkel and **R' Yose** darshens it from the inner Mizbe'ach)? **A:** **R' Yehuda** holds that we learn something outside the Heichal from another thing outside the Heichal. **R' Yose** holds that we learn a keili from another keili and we don't learn a keili from a fixed structure.
 - **Rava** said, **R' Yehuda** would agree that the blood of the korbanos could not be sprinkled on the floor and would have to be offered on the Mizbe'ach itself. We see this from a Braisa that says that **R' Yehuda** holds that on Erev Pesach they would take a cup-full of blood from the floor and throw it onto the Mizbe'ach, so that if the blood of a korbon spilled entirely onto the floor, this offering of the mixed bloods would make that korbon valid. Now, if the floor was valid for offering blood as well, there would be no reason to do this.
 - **Q:** Maybe he holds that the floor is valid for offering blood, but he holds that it must be thrown there by the Kohen deliberately for that purpose, and that is why it is not valid until it is later thrown on the Mizbe'ach (because it wasn't thrown onto the floor with that purpose)!? **A:** If that is true, the Kohen should take the cup-full of blood and just spill it back onto the floor.
 - **Q:** It may be that it was thrown onto the Mizbe'ach, because that is the *best* way to do the mitzvah, but in truth it would be valid even if thrown onto the floor.
- **R' Elazar** said, one may not eat the leftover of a mincha when the Mizbe'ach is damaged. This is based on the pasuk of "v'ichluha matzos eitzel haMizbe'ach", which can't mean that the mincha must be eaten next to the Mizbe'ach, because that is not true. Rather, it means that the mincha may only be eaten when the Mizbe'ach is undamaged.
 - **Q:** How do we know that this applies to other kodshei kodashim as well? **A:** There is a gezeira shava between a mincha and other kodshei kodashim.
 - **Q:** How do we know that this applies to kodshei kalim as well? **A:** **Abaye** said, we learn this from the drasha of **R' Yose in the name of R' Yishmael** in a Braisa, who says, we would think that even after the Churban a person can bring maaser sheini to Yerushalayim and eat it there. We can ask, that maaser sheini must be brought Yerushalayim just as there is a requirement to bring a bechor to Yerushalayim, and therefore just as a bechor is only brought when there is a Beis Hamikdash, the same should be true for maaser! However, we would say that bechor is different, because it must be offered on the Mizbe'ach. We would then say that bikkurim shows that this logic is not true, because it is not offered on the Mizbe'ach and yet it is only brought

when there is a Beis Hamikdash. He says that that is also not sound logic, because bikkurim is different than maser, because bikkurim must at least be placed onto the Mizbe'ach, but maser does not have this requirement and therefore it could be thought to bring it to Yerushalayim even when there is no Beis Hamikdash. To prevent us from saying that, the pasuk makes a hekesh from maser to bechor, which teaches that just as bechor is only brought when there is a Beis Hamikdash, the same is true for maser sheini.

- **Q:** Why didn't **R' Yishmael** try and learn maser from a mah hatzad of bechor and bikkurim? **A:** It is refuted by saying that the two of them require some use of the Mizbe'ach, which is why they are not brought if there is no Beis Hamikdash, but maser does not require the Mizbe'ach, and therefore we would think that it may be brought even after the Churban.
- **Q:** If **R' Yishmael** holds that the kedusha of Yerushalayim remains forever ("kidsha l'shata v'kidsha l'asid lavo") then he should hold that even a bechor could be eaten there today, and if he holds that Yerushalayim no longer has its kedusha then he should even ask the question whether a bechor that was offered before the Churban could have been eaten in Yerushalayim after the Churban, instead of only focusing his question on maser sheini!? **A: Ravina** said, he holds that Yerushalayim no longer has its kedusha, and in the case of the bechor which was offered when there was a Beis Hamikdash but not yet eaten before the Churban, he says that it may not be eaten because we make a hekesh from its blood to its meat – just as the blood may only be offered when there is a Mizbe'ach, the meat may only be eaten when there is a Mizbe'ach. He then makes another hekesh from bechor to maser, to teach that maser too, may only be eaten when there is a Beis Hamikdash. We see that a bechor, and by extension all kodshei kalim, cannot be eaten without the presence of a valid Mizbe'ach.
 - **Q:** How can something that itself was learned through a hekesh now be used to teach something else through another hekesh? **A:** This type of learning is only not done regarding kodashim. Maser sheini is considered to be chulin, and may therefore be learned through this type of hekesh as well.
 - **Q:** That is fine according to the view that we look at the final thing that is being derived to see if it is chulin or kodesh, to decide if we can make this hekesh. However, according to the view that we look at the thing that is teaching, how can we learn this double hekesh? **A:** The blood and meat of a bechor are considered one thing, and the hekesh between them is therefore not looked at as a hekesh for determining whether a double hekesh is being used.
- **Ravin** repeated this answer of **Abaye** to **R' Yirmiya**. **R' Yirmiya** said this is wrong. We have two Braisos. One says that when the Mishkan was taken down and the Mizbe'ach was moved the kodashim that were still in existence became passul, and the other says that the kodashim can be eaten in "2 places", which suggests that kodashim could continue to be eaten after the Mishkan was taken down. Presumably, we would answer this contradiction by saying it is kodshei kodashim that become passul and kodshei kalim that remain valid. This shows that kodshei kalim do not become passul just because the Mizbe'ach is no longer in a valid state!
 - **Ravina** said, it may be that both Braisos are referring to kodshei kalim. The first Braisa follows the view of **R' Yishmael** and the second Braisa follows the view of the **Rabanan** who argue on **R' Yishmael**.
 - The Gemara says, we can also answer that both Braisos are talking about kodshei kodashim. When the second Braisa refers to "2 places" it refers to 1) while the Mishkan is still up, and 2) after the Levi'im took down the Mishkan but before they moved the Mizbe'ach. We would have thought that once the curtains of the Azarah are taken down the

korbon becomes passul as a korbon that has left the Azarah. The Braisa therefore teaches that it remains valid.

- **Q:** Maybe say that the korbon does become passul when the curtains are taken down!? **A:** The pasuk says “v’nasah Ohel Moed”, which teaches that even as it is travelling it is still called the “Ohel Moed”.