



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

Zevachim Daf Kuf Vuv

PEREK HASHOCHET V'HAMAALAH -- PEREK SHLOSHA ASSAR

MISHNA

- If one shechts and offers a korban outside (the Azarah) he is chayuv for the shechting and chayuv for the offering up. **R' Yose Haglili** says, if he shechted it inside but offered it outside he is chayuv for the offering. However, if he shechted it outside and then offered it outside, he would not be chayuv for the offering, because he offered something that was already passul. The **Chachomim** said to him, when he shechts inside and then takes it out it becomes passul (and yet you agree that he would be chayuv for offering it, so when he shechted it outside it should be no different).
- If a tamei person ate kodesh that was itself tamei or was tahor, he is chayuv for eating kodesh while he is tamei. **R' Yose Haglili** says, if a tamei person ate kodesh that was tahor he is chayuv, but if he ate kodesh that is tamei he is patur, because he ate something that was already tamei. The **Chachomim** said to him, when the tamei eats kodesh that is tahor, as soon as he touched the kodesh it became tamei (and yet you agree that he would be chayuv, so when he eats kodesh that is already tamei it should be no different).
 - If a tahor person ate kodesh that was tamei he is patur (from a chatas), because the chiyuv for a chatas is only for when a tamei person eats kodesh.

GEMARA

- **Q:** There is a pasuk that teaches the punishment for offering outside the Azarah – “v'ehl pesach Ohel Moed lo yivi'enu”, and there is a pasuk that gives the warning – “hishamer lecha pen taaleh olosecha”. However, with regard to shechting outside, although there is a pasuk that teaches the punishment – “v'ehl pesach Ohel Moed lo hevi'o”, there is no pasuk that teaches the warning!? **A:** The warning is the pasuk of “v'lo yizbichu ohd”.
 - **Q:** **R' Elazar** uses this pasuk for a different drasha!? **A:** We darshen the pasuk as “v'lo yizbichu” and we darshen as if it was written “v'lo ohd”, and we therefore have two drashos.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that this pasuk is needed to teach regarding a korban that a person was makdish at a time when bamos were allowed and he then offered it outside the Mikdash at a time when bamos were no longer allowed, in which case there would be no chiyuv kares (or chatas), but only a lav!? **A:** Rather, **Abaye** said, it is learned from a kal v'chomer – if for a korban where there is no kares when it is shechted outside (the korban that he was makdish when bamos were allowed) there is still a warning, then for a korban where there is kares if it was shechted outside, there is for sure a warning of a lav as well (the lav is needed along with the chiyuv kares to obligate the person to bring a chatas)!
 - **Q:** **Ravina** said to **R' Ashi**, if this is true, that when there is a chiyuv kares for something there is no need for the Torah to also write a lav, then the Torah should not write the lav for cheilev and it can be learned from a kal v'chomer from neveila – neveila doesn't carry kares and yet it has a lav, then cheilev which does carry kares for sure has a lav!? **A:** **Rava** said, cheilev could not be learned from neveila, because we can ask that neveila is different because it gives off tumah. You also can't learn cheilev from the lav against eating tamei sheratzim, because we can ask that tamei sheratzim give off tumah with any small amount! You also can't learn cheilev from the lav against eating tahor sheratzim, because

we can ask that tahor sheratzim are assur to be eaten even in a small amount (smaller than a kezayis)! You also can't learn cheilev from the lav against eating orlah or kelayim, because we can ask that they are different, because they are assur b'hana'ah! You also can't learn cheilev from the lav of shmitta produce, because we can ask that shmitta produce is different because its issur carries over to the money of the proceeds of its sale! You also can't learn cheilev from the lav against eating terumah (by a non-Kohen), because we can ask that it is different, because there is never a case where it is mutar (whereas the cheilev of a chaya is mutar)! You can't even learn cheilev from all the above combined, because of the reason that cheilev is different in that there are cases when it is mutar.

- **Rava** said, if there is a problem with **Abaye's** kal v'chomer, it is the following. A Mishna says that the mitzvos of Pesach and bris milah are only an assei. Now, according to **Abaye** we should make his kal v'chomer from the lav of nossar and say that Pesach and milah which have a chiyuv kares, certainly have a lav as well!? **A: R' Ashi** said, I repeated this to **R' Kahana** and he told me that they can't be learned from nossar, because nossar is different in that it can never be rectified (whereas a Pesach can be brought on Pesach Sheini, and a milah can always be done after the 8th day as well).
- **Q:** How could **Abaye** say that we learn the lav through a kal v'chomer? Even according to the view that we can punish based on a kal v'chomer, we cannot make assur with a lav through a kal v'chomer!? **A:** Rather, the source is like **R' Yochanan** said – we have a gezeira shava of "hava'ah" between offering outside and shechting outside. This teaches that just as for offering there is only punishment with having the lav, so too with regard to shechting outside there is a punishment and it is along with a lav. **A2: Rava** said, the source is based on a gezeira shava on the word "sham" between the offering and the shechting.