



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

Zevachim Daf Ayin

- The Gemara continues its lengthy discussion towards understanding the view of **R' Yehuda**, who says that melika will not prevent a bird that was a treifah from becoming tamei as a neveila. The Gemara said that he learns it from an extra word "treifah" in the pasuk regarding birds. The Gemara then asked that based on this he should also find the word "treifa" written with regard to cheilev to be extra. The Gemara had a back and forth about this and now continues.
 - **Abaye** said, the word treifah in the pasuk regarding cheilev is not extra. It is needed to teach that the cheilev of a treifah that died without shechita does not have tumas neveila. If not for this word we would think that since a non-kosher animal is assur when alive and an animal that is a treifah is assur when alive, we should say that just as the fats of a non-kosher animal are tamei, the fats of a treifah are also tamei.
 - **Q:** Based on this we should say that the word "treifah" written regarding a bird neveila is also not extra!? If not for this word we would say that since a non-kosher bird is assur to be eaten and a bird that is a treifah is assur to be eaten. Just as a non-kosher bird does not make tumas neveila when swallowed a bird that is a treifah is treated the same!? Furthermore, how can **Abaye** compare a non-kosher animal to a treifah? A non-kosher animal was never fit – it was born assur, whereas a treifah was kosher before it became a treifah! **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the words "neveila" and "treifah" written regarding cheilev are needed, because the Torah is teaching that the issur of neveila and of treifa take effect on top of the issur of cheilev. The Torah needs to separately teach that this is true of neveilah, which could not be learned from treifa, because it is an issur that only comes about after death, and needs to teach it regarding treifah, which could not be learned from neveila, because it does not carry tumah like a neveilah.
 - **Q:** What does **R' Meir** (who argues on **R' Yehuda**) do with the word "treifah" in the pasuk of the kosher bird neveila? **A:** He uses it to teach that a chullin bird shechted inside the Azarah does not have tumas neveila.
 - **Q:** How does **R' Yehuda** learn that? **A:** He uses the word "treifa" written in another pasuk.
 - **Q:** What does **R' Meir** darshen with the word treifa in this other pasuk? **A:** He says that one pasuk comes to exclude the chullin bird shechted inside the Azarah (to teach that it does not have tumas neveila) and one teaches that a non-kosher bird doesn't have tumas neveila. **R' Yehuda** would learn this from the extra word "neveila".
 - **Q:** What does **R' Meir** darshen with this word "neveila"? **A:** He says it teaches that the minimum amount of a kezayis must be eaten to make the person tamei.
 - **Q:** Why can't that be learned from the earlier pasuk that says "achila", which is always understood to refer to a kezayis? **A:** One teaches the minimum of a kezayis and one teaches that it must be eaten "kidei achilas pras". We would think that since the halacha of tumah coming about when it is swallowed is a chiddush, and it should therefore take place even when it is eaten in longer than a kidei achilas pras.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "v'cheilev neveila v'cheilev treifah". The pasuk is referring to cheilev of a kosher animal and teaches that the fats of this neveila don't have tumas neveila. Maybe say it refers to the cheilev of a non-kosher animal? The Torah has said that things are tahor with regard to shechita and things are tahor with regard to cheilev. Just as shechita only

makes a kosher animal tahor, so too the cheilev that is tahor must be from a kosher animal. Maybe instead say that the Torah said that things are tahor from having tumas neveila and things are tahor with regard to cheilev. Just as it is non-kosher species that are tahor from neveila so too it is non-kosher animals whose cheilev is tahor? The pasuk therefore says “treifa”, which teaches that it is referring to something that can fall into the category of treifa – which is only a kosher animal. We would then think to only exclude non-kosher animals, but to say that the cheilev of kosher chayos will also not be tamei, since it can also fall into the category of treifa. The pasuk therefore says “v’achol lo sochluhu”, which teaches that the pasuk refers to an animal whose cheilev is assur but whose meat is mutar. This excludes a chaya, whose cheilev is mutar.

- **R’ Yaakov bar Abba** asked **Rava**, the Braisa seems to say that the neveila of a non-kosher animal is not tamei!? **Rava** said, that is referring to birds, not animals.
- **R’ Yochanan** said, when **R’ Meir** said that melika on a bird that was a treifa prevents it from having tumas neveila, that is only if the bird didn’t have a mum. **R’ Elazar** said that **R’ Meir** said his ruling even when the bird had a mum.
 - We learned that **R’ Bibi in the name of R’ Elazar** said that **R’ Meir** said his ruling even if the bird had a mum, and even if done to geese and chickens (which are not fit to be brought as a korbon).
 - **R’ Yirmiya** asked, what if someone does the “eglah arufah” process using a goat instead of a calf? Would that goat have tumas neveila? Do we say that geese and chickens are considered to be of the same species as the bird korbanos and that is why the melika on it prevents the tumah, but a goat is a “beheima dakah” which is considered to be of a different species than the calf which is a “beheima gasa” and therefore the goat will become tamei as a neveila, or do we say that goats and calves are both beheimos and therefore considered to be of the same species?
 - When **R’ Dimi** repeated this, **Abaye** said, this suggests that an eglah arufa does not have tumas neveila. **R’ Dimi** said that is correct, and as the yeshiva of **R’ Yannai** said this is based on the fact that the pasuk says “kapparah” regarding the eglah arufah, which teaches that just as a korbon does not become tamei neveila the same is true with an eglah arufah.
 - **Q: R’ Nosson** the father of **R’ Huna** asked, a Braisa learns from a pasuk that the cheilev of an eglah arufah does not have tumas neveila. Now, if the whole eglah arufah doesn’t have tumas neveila, why would I need a pasuk to teach that the cheilev doesn’t have tumas neveila? **A:** The pasuk is needed for where the calf was shechted after it became assur b’hana’ah, instead of it being decapitated from behind as is supposed to be done to it.
 - **Q:** If it was shechted, the shechita should prevent it from becoming tamei as a neveila!? **A:** The pasuk is needed for a case where the calf died without shechita or decapitation. In that case the animal is tamei as a neveila, and the pasuk teaches that the cheilev is not tamei.
 - **Q:** This suggests that the animal is assur b’hana’ah even while it is still alive!? **A:** This is correct. We find that **R’ Yanai** said regarding the time when the eglah arufah becomes assur b’hana’ah – I heard an answer as to when this happens, but have forgotten it. However, my colleagues have said that it becomes assur when it enters the rocky valley.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK CHATAS HA’OF!!!