



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

### Zevachim Daf Pey Gimmel

#### NICHNAS L'CHAPER

- A Braisa says, **R' Eliezer** says we have a gezeira shava on the words "l'chaper bakodesh" from the Kohen Gadol entering the Heichal on Yom Kippur. Just as the pasuk there teaches that noone may be in the Heichal even if the Kohen Gadol has not yet offered the ketores, so too here the pasuk means it is passul even if it was not yet offered. **R' Shimon** says, we learn a gezeira shava on the word "l'chaper" from the korbon of Yom Kippur – just as that refers to the korbon when it is offered, so too by us the pasuk teaches that it only becomes passul when it is offered.
  - The machlokes is that **R' Eliezer** holds we learn something that is done outside the Kodesh HaKodashim from something else done outside, and not from the korbon of Yom Kippur which is brought inside. **R' Shimon** holds that we would rather learn the halacha of an animal from that of another animal, rather than to learn the halacha of an animal from the halacha of a person.

#### R' YEHUDA OMER...

- This suggests that he holds that if it is brought in b'meidid the blood becomes passul.
  - **Q:** Would this be only if he actually offered it or even if he only intended to offer it? **A:** **R' Yirmiya** said, there is a machlokes in a Braisa between **R' Yehuda** and **R' Meir** as to what words are used for a gezeira shava to teach that the one who burns the korbanos that must be burned makes his clothing tamei. **R' Yehuda** learns this from a gezeira shava on the word "chatas" and **R' Meir** learns it from a gezeira shava on the word "l'chaper". Now, what does **R' Yehuda** do with those words "l'chaper"? It must be that he uses it like **R' Shimon**, to teach that the blood only becomes passul when it is actually offered inside, not when it is only intended to be offered inside the Heichal.

### HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL HAZE VACHIM SHENISARVU!!!

### PEREK HAMIZBE'ACH MIKADEISH -- PEREK TESH'I

#### MISHNA

- The Mizbe'ach makes kadosh that which is fit for it (even if the item was passul).
  - **R' Yehoshua** said, this means that anything that is fit for the *fire* of the Mizbe'ach, if it was brought up onto the Mizbe'ach it is not taken down. This is learned from the pasuk of "hee ha'olah ahl mokdah" – just as an olah that is fit to be on the *fire* of the Mizbe'ach, if it is brought up it is not taken down, so too anything that is fit for the *fire* of the Mizbe'ach, if it is brought up it is not taken down. **R' Gamliel** said, this means that anything that is fit for the Mizbe'ach (any part of the Mizbe'ach), if it was brought up onto the Mizbe'ach it is not taken down. This is learned from the pasuk of "hee ha'olah ahl mokdah ahl haMizbe'ach" – just as an olah that is fit to be on the Mizbe'ach, if it is brought up it is not taken down, so too anything that is fit for the Mizbe'ach, if it is brought up it is not taken down.
    - The only difference between them is regarding the blood and nesachim of a korbon – according to **R' Gamliel** once they are brought up they are not taken down, and according to **R' Yehoshua** they would be taken down (since they are not placed on the *fire* of the Mizbe'ach).
  - **R' Shimon** said, if the korbon is valid and its nesachim are passul, or visa-versa, or even if both became passul, and they were brought up onto the Mizbe'ach, the korbon would not be taken down but the nesachim would be.

## GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna suggests that the Mizbe'ach makes kadosh an item that is fit for it, but not something that is not. What does this come to exclude? **A: R' Pappa** said, it excludes a kemitza that was not made kadosh in a keili.
  - **Q: Ravina** asked, why would the kemitza be different than the case of **Ulla**, who said that the eimurim of kodshei kalim that were brought up onto the Mizbe'ach before the blood was offered, are not taken down, because they have become "the bread of the Mizbe'ach". Why is the kemitza different? **A:** The difference is that the eimurim are not lacking anything that needs to be done to them, whereas the kemitza is.

## R' YEHOSHUA OMER KOL HARA'UY LA'ISHIM...

- **Q:** According to **R' Gamliel** also, the pasuk says "olah ahl mokda"! **A:** That teaches that pieces that popped out of the fire must be put back into the fire.
  - **Q:** How does **R' Yehoshua** learn this? **A:** From the pasuk of "asher tochal ha'aish". **R' Gamliel** says this teaches that only parts of an olah that popped off are put back, but parts of the ketores that popped off are not put back. **R' Yehoshua** says, if it teaches that only an olah and not the ketores is returned to the fire, it thereby also teaches that an olah is returned to the fire, so both things can be learned from this pasuk.

## R' GAMLIEL OMER KOL HARA'UY...

- **Q:** According to **R' Yehoshua** also, the pasuk says "Mizbe'ach"! **A:** That is giving the reason that the Torah says that even a passul item should remain on the Mizbe'ach – because anything fit for the fire is made kadosh by the Mizbe'ach. **R' Gamliel** says, another pasuk says "Mizbe'ach", and we learn from there. **R' Yehoshua** says, one mention is needed for a korbon which had a period of validity, and one is needed for a korbon that did not have a period of validity. **R' Gamliel** says, that since passul things are said to be left on the Mizbe'ach, there is no reason to think that there is a difference between something that had a period of validity and something that did not.

## R' SHIMON OMER HAZEVA'CH KASHER...

- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon** says, the word "olah" in the pasuk teaches that just as an olah is brought on its own account and remains on the Mizbe'ach once it is brought up, so too all korbanos that come on their own account remain there once they are brought up. This excludes nesachim that are brought on account of the korbanos for which they are brought.
- A Braisa says, **R' Yose Haglili** says, the pasuk says "kol hanogeya baMizbe'ach yikdash", which suggests that the Mizbe'ach makes kadosh anything that is put on it – whether it is fit to be put on it or not. The pasuk therefore then says "kevasim", which teaches that just as lambs are fit for the Mizbe'ach, so too only things fit for it are made kadosh. **R' Akiva** says, the pasuk says "olah", which teaches that just as an olah is fit for the Mizbe'ach, so too only things fit for it are made kadosh.
  - **Q:** What is the difference between them? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** said, a passul olah bird would be the difference. According to **R' Akiva** it would remain on the Mizbe'ach (it too is an olah), and according to **R' Yose Haglili** it would not (because the bird is not an animal).
    - **Q:** According to **R' Yose** the pasuk also says olah!? **A:** If it would only say "kevasim" we would say that even live animals should not be taken down. The word "olah" teaches that a live animal would be taken down.
    - **Q:** According to **R' Akiva** the pasuk also says kevasim!? **A:** If it would only say "olah" we would say that even a passul mincha should not be taken down. The word "kevasim" teaches this only applies to living beings.
  - **Q:** What is the difference between these Tanna'in and the Tanna'im in our Mishna? **A: R' Pappa** said, the difference would be regarding a kemitza that was made kadosh in a keili and then became passul. According to the Tanna'im of our Mishna it would not be taken down, but according to these Tanna'im of the Braisa it would be taken down.
- **Reish Lakish** said:
  - With regard to a mincha that is brought on its own (that became passul and was brought up onto the Mizbe'ach), according to the Tanna'im of our Mishna it would not be taken down and according to **R' Yose** and **R' Akiva** it would be taken down.

- With regard to a mincha that is brought on account of an animal korban, according to **R' Gamliel and R' Yehoshua** it would not be taken down, and according to all the others it would be taken down.
- With regard to nesachim that are brought on its own, according to **R' Gamliel and R' Shimon** it would not be brought down, and according to all the others it would be taken down.
- With regard to nesachim that are brought on account of an animal korban, according to **R' Gamliel** it is not taken down, and according to all the others it would be taken down.
- **Q:** What is the chiddush of **Reish Lakish**? This all seems obvious!? **A:** He was teaching us the shita of **Rava**, that a person may bring a minchas nesachim as a nedavah.
  - **Q:** Why didn't he simply state **Rava's** rule, instead of arriving at it in this somewhat backward way? **A:** Rather, his chiddush is regarding nesachim that are brought on account of an animal korban, but that were not brought at the same time as the animal, as we have learned that such nesachim may be brought at a later date. We would think that they are treated like nesachim brought on their own account (since they are not being brought with the korban) and therefore **R' Shimon** would agree that they are not taken down. **Reish Lakish** therefore teaches that they are considered as nesachim brought on account of a korban and **R' Shimon** would therefore hold that they are taken down.