



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

Zevachim Daf Kuf Ches

R' YOSE HAGLILI OMER...

- **Rebbi** answered on behalf of **R' Yose Haglili**, that the reason one is chayuv when one shechts a korbon inside the Azarah and then offers it outside is because there was a period of validity for this korbon, whereas when it is shechted outside and offered outside he is be patur for the offering, because this korbon never had a period of validity. **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** answered on behalf of **R' Yose Haglili**, that the reason one is chayuv when one shechts a korbon inside the Azarah and then offers it outside is because if it is taken out after the shechita and then brought back in and brought up onto the Mizbe'ach, it would be offered and would not be taken down. However, if it was shechted outside, even if it was then brought inside and brought up onto the Mizbe'ach, it would not be offered and would be taken down.
 - **Q:** What is the difference between these two answers? **A: Ze'iri** said, the difference would be a case where the shechita inside took place at night (this korbon would have no period of validity, but if it was brought up onto the Mizbe'ach it would not be taken down). **Rabbah** said the difference would be a case where the kabbalah was done in a keili that was not a kli kodesh (this korbon would have no period of validity, but if it was brought up onto the Mizbe'ach it would not be taken down).

TAMEI SHE'ACHAL BEIN KODESH...

- **Q:** The **Rabanan** seem to have posed a very strong question to **R' Yose**!? **A: Rava** said, if the person first became tamei and the meat of the korbon then became tamei, all would agree that he would be chayuv for eating that meat, because a tamei person eating kodashim is chayuv kares. The machlokes is where the meat was first tamei and then the person became tamei. In this case the meat was already assur to be eaten as tamei kodashim, which does not carry kares. The **Rabanan** say that when the person becomes tamei there is "issur kolel" (since he now becomes assur to eat even tahor kodashim) and the issur with kares even takes effect on tamei kodashim as well. **R' Yose Haglili** does not agree to the principle of issur kolel, and therefore the issur of a tamei person eating kodashim will not take effect on a tamei piece of kodashim, since it was already assur to be eaten.
 - **Q: R' Yose** should hold that the issur of the tamei person should take effect, because the issur of a tamei person eating kodesh is more stringent in that he would be chayuv kares (as we find that he says this logic elsewhere)!? **A: R' Ashi** said, it may be that the issur of tamei kodashim is more stringent in that the tumah cannot be removed from it by immersing it in a mikvah. Therefore, we can't say that one is more stringent than the other.

MISHNA

- There is a chumra that the issur of shechita outside has over the issur of offering a korbon outside, and there is a chumra that the issur of offering has over the issur of shechita.
 - The chumra of shechita is that if someone shechts a korbon outside the Azarah with intent to shecht it for a person to eat, he would be chayuv, whereas if someone offers a korbon outside to a person (in worship of the person) he would be patur.
 - The chumra of offering is that if two people hold the knife and do a shechita outside they would be patur. However, if two people hold onto a limb of an animal and offer it up outside, they would be chayuv.
- If a person offered up a piece of the animal, and then offered up another piece, and another, **R' Shimon** says he would be chayuv a separate chatas for each act of offering up. **R' Yose** says he would be chayuv only one korbon. He would also not be chayuv unless he offers the korbon on

top of a Mizbe'ach. **R' Shimon** says he would be chayuv even if he offered it up on a rock or stone.

GEMARA

- **Q:** One who offers up a korbun outside to a person is patur, because the pasuk says "LaHashem". The pasuk regarding shechita outside also says "LaHashem", so one who shechts for a person should also be patur!? **A:** The pasuk regarding shechita says "ish ish", which teaches that he is chayuv even if he shechted for a person.
 - **Q:** Regarding offering the korbun the pasuk also says "ish ish"!? **A:** That is needed to teach that if two people together offer a limb, they are chayuv.
 - **Q:** If so, "ish ish" written regarding shechita should also teach that if two people hold the knife and do the shechita they should be chayuv!? **A:** The pasuk regarding shechita says "hahu", which teaches that only when one person does the shechita he is chayuv.
 - **Q:** The pasuk regarding offering up the korbun also says "hahu", and should therefore teach that only when one person does the offering is he chayuv!? **A:** That "hahu" is needed to teach that one who offered up b'shogeg, or b'oneis, or was misled into thinking it was mutar, that they are patur.
 - **Q:** The "hahu" written regarding shechita should be used to teach this as well!? **A:** The pasuk regarding shechita says "hahu" twice.
 - **Q:** If so, what does the word "LaHashem" in the pasuk of shechita come to teach? **A:** It comes to exclude the goat that is to be sent to the Azazel, and teaches that if that goat is shechted outside, the person would be patur.

CHOMER B'HALA'AH...

- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon** says, the pasuk regarding offering up the korbun outside says "ish ish", which teaches that if two people hold onto the limb and offer it, they are both chayuv. We would have thought to make a kal v'chomer and say that if for shechita outside, where he is chayuv if he shechts it for a person, he is patur if two people do the shechita, then for offering outside, where he is patur if he offered for a person, then surely if two people offer it together they should be patur. **R' Yose** says that "hahu" teaches that if two people offer it together they would be patur. The pasuk only says "ish ish" because the Torah writes in verbiage like people speak.
 - **R' Shimon** uses "hahu" to teach that one who offered up b'shogeg, or b'oneis, or was misled into thinking it was mutar, that they are patur. **R' Yose** says the pasuk could have said "hu" and instead says "hahu", which allows for 2 drashos. **R' Shimon** doesn't darshen two drashos from this one word.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yose**, if the "ish ish" written regarding offering outside is not meant to be darshened, the same should be said for the "ish ish" written regarding shechting outside. If so, how does he know that one who shechts for a person is chayuv? **A:** He learns it from the pasuk of "dam yeichasheiv la'ish hahu", which teaches that even if he shechts for a person, he is chayuv.

HE'ELA V'CHAZAR V'HE'ELA...

- **Reish Lakish** said, the machlokes is where one offers up multiple limbs from a korbun. In this case **R' Yose** holds that the pasuk says "laasos oso", which teaches that he is only chayuv for offering up the entire korbun, whereas **R' Shimon** says this teaches that he is chayuv separately for each limb. However, all would agree that if he offers up one limb in parts, he would only be chayuv one chatas. **R' Yochanan** said, the machlokes is regarding a case where one offers up a part of one limb from an animal that was shechted inside. **R' Shimon** says he would be chayuv, because the only time a full limb is needed to make him chayuv is when the korbun was shechted outside, and **R' Yose** says that he would be patur, because he is only chayuv for the offering outside of a full limb. However, if a person offered 4 or 5 limbs outside, all would agree that he would be chayuv a chatas for each and every limb that was offered up. This argues on **Ulla**, who said that **R' Shimon** and **R' Yose** agree that if a korbun was shechted inside and was then offered in part (even a partial limb) outside, that he would be chayuv. The machlokes is only regarding a korbun that was shechted outside and was then offered up in part. In that case **R' Yose** would say that he is patur and **R' Shimon** would say that he is chayuv. **Another version** of **Ulla** is that he says that all agree that regarding a korbun that was shechted outside and was then offered up in part that he would be patur. The machlokes is regarding a korbun that was

shechted inside and was then offered in part, in which case **R' Yose** would say that he is patur and **R' Shimon** would say that he is chayuv.

- The first version of **Ulla** argues on **Shmuel's** father, who said that **R' Yose** would hold that if partial pieces pop out of the fire on the Mizbe'ach they need not be put back into the fire.

V'EINO CHAYUV AHD SHEYAALAH...

- **R' Huna** said, **R' Yose's** view is based on the pasuk of "vayiven Noach Mizbe'ach LaHashem", which shows that it must be an erected Mizbe'ach, not just any rock. **R' Yochanan** said that **R' Shimon's** view is based on the pasuk of "vayikach Mano'ach es gedi ha'izim v'es hamincha vayaal ahl hatzur (on the rock) LaHashem".
 - **R' Shimon** would say that Noach built a taller Mizbe'ach only so that it should be easier to offer the korbon. **R' Yose** would say that Mano'ach offered the korbon on a rock, because he was told to do so by a Malach, and therefore that can't be used as a basis for future times.
 - We can also say that **R' Shimon's** view is as he says in a Braisa, that a Mizbe'ach is only needed for the Mikdash, but not for when bamos were allowed.
 - **Q: R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** asked, if a Mizbe'ach is needed for a bamah, does this Mizbe'ach need to have the horns, a ramp, a base, and be square like the Mizbe'ach in the Mikdash? **A: R' Yirmiya** said, these things are only needed for the large bamah that was used for the tzibbur, but would not be needed for an individual's bamah.