



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

Zevachim Daf Kuf Yud

V'KULAN SHECHASRU

- **Q:** If any of the offerings in the Mishna were taken out of the Azarah when they were complete and then some was missing, is that considered to be less than a complete offering and the one who offers it outside will therefore be patur, or not? Do we say that since it anyway became passul by leaving the Azarah it doesn't make a difference if it is complete, or do we say that one is only chayuv for offering up a complete offering outside, not anything less? **A: Abaye** said, the Mishna said that **R' Elazar** said that he is patur unless he offers all of it.
 - **Q: Rabbah bar R' Chanan** said to **Abaye**, the question was asked according to the view of the **Rabanan**, and you answer based on the view of **R' Elazar**!? **A: Abaye** said, "I explicitly heard from **Rav** that the **Rabanan** and **R' Elazar** only argue in a case where the offering is complete, but where it is less than complete the **Rabanan** agree that the person would not be chayuv for offering it outside." Now, presumably the case is that it became less than complete outside the Azarah, and we see that the **Rabanan** hold that even in this case the person would be patur!
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. The case in which they argue may be where it became less inside the Azarah, but in a case where it became less outside, it may be that the **Rabanan** would say that he is chayuv.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from the Mishna which said that if any of the offerings listed in the Mishna were less than complete and were then offered outside he would be patur. Presumably, this refers to where it became less than complete outside! **A:** It may be referring to where it became less than complete inside.

HAMAKRIV KODASHIM

- **Q:** Why is one chayuv for offering eimurim that are attached to meat? The meat acts as a chatzitza between the eimurim and the Mizbe'ach!? **A: Shmuel** said, the case is where he turns the pieces over so that the eimurim are touching the Mizbe'ach. **R' Yochanan** said, it may be talking about where he didn't turn the pieces over, but the Mishna follows the view of **R' Shimon** who says that he is chayuv for offering on any rock, and a Mizbe'ach is not needed. Therefore, he would also hold that a chatzitza would not be a problem. **Rav** said, that the meat would not be a chatzitza, because they are all parts of the animal and things of like kind are not considered to be a chatzitza.

MISHNA

- If the kemitza was not taken from a mincha and a person offered the mincha outside, he is patur. If a kemitza was separated and then put back in with the rest of the mincha and a person then offered it outside, he would be chayuv.

GEMARA

- **Q:** When the kometz is returned to the rest of the mincha, why don't we say that the rest of the mincha is mevatal the kometz, and if so the person who offers it outside should be patur, because he did not offer a kometz outside!? **A: R' Zeira** said, we have a gezeira shava of "haktara" between the kometz and the leftover mincha. This teaches that just as one kometz does not become batel in another kometz, so too leftover mincha is not mevatal a kometz.

MISHNA

- If only one of the kometz and the levonah was offered outside, he would be chayuv. **R' Elazar** says he would be patur until he offers the other one as well. If he offered one inside and one outside, all would agree that he would be chayuv.

- With regard to the two spoons of levonah of the Lechem Hapanim, of which one was offered outside, he would be chayuv. **R' Elazar** says he would be patur unless he offers the second spoon as well. If one was offered inside and the other outside, he would be chayuv.

GEMARA

- **R' Yitzchak Nafcha** asked, what is the halacha whether a kometz can be matir part of the leftover mincha (that he says corresponds to it) without having offered the levonah? Do we say that the offering of the kometz weakens the issur on the entire mincha, but it does not get removed totally until the levonah is offered as well, or do we say that the offering of the kometz entirely removes the issur from part of the mincha?
 - **Q:** Who is this question asked according to? It can't be asked according to **R' Meir**, because he says that one can even create piggul with an intent during the offering of the kemitza, so he surely holds that it entirely removes the issur from part of the mincha! It can't be asked according to the **Rabanan**, because they say that this intent would not create piggul, which means that they hold that the offering of the kometz only weakens the issur, but does not remove it entirely! It can't be according to **R' Elazar** in our Mishna (who said that he is patur for offering the kometz outside without the levonah), because he clearly follows the **Rabanan!** **A:** Rather, the question is according to the **Rabanan** in our Mishna (who say he is chayuv for the offering of the kometz or the levonah alone). The question is, does it only weaken the issur or does it totally remove the issur? The Gemara says **TEIKU**.

MISHNA

- If a person does a partial zrika outside he is chayuv. **R' Elazar** said, one who pours the waters of the Chag outside on the Chag would also be chayuv. **R' Nechemya** said, if one offered the leftover blood of a korbbon outside, he would be chayuv.

GEMARA

- **Rava** said, **R' Elazar** would agree that one who did a partial zrika outside would be chayuv, because we find that he holds in a Mishna that a partial zrika makes a korbbon valid when done properly.

R' ELAZAR OMER AHF HAMENASECH MEI HACHAG BACHAG BACHUTZ

- **R' Yochanan in the name of R' Menachem Yodfa'ah** said, **R' Elazar** is following the view of his rebbi **R' Akiva**, who holds that pouring of the water on Succos is D'Oraisa, based on a drasha in a pasuk that teaches that there is a pouring of something in addition to the pouring of wine.
 - **Q: Reish Lakish** asked, if that is true, he should say that just as there must be 3 lugin of wine poured, there must also be 3 lugin of water poured, but in the Mishna he referred to one who "pours water", which suggests that there is no 3 lug requirement!? Also, he should compare it to the pouring of wine and say that just as one is chayuv if he pours wine outside at any time during the year, the same should be true for the pouring of water, and yet **R' Elazar** in the Mishna says "bachag" (on the chag)!? **A: Reish Lakish** said, **R' Menachem Yodfa'ah** must have forgotten the statement of **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan in the name of R' Nechunya of Bikas Beis Chorson**, who said that the requirement to pour water is learned from a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai, not based on the pasuk, and therefore there is no comparison between it and the pouring of wine.
- A Braisa says, if one pours 3 lugin of water outside on Succos, he is chayuv. **R' Elazar** says, if he filled a keili with them to make it kadosh to be used for Succos, he would be chayuv.
 - **Q:** What is the practical difference between these views? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, they argue on whether there is a maximum amount associated with the pouring of water for Succos. The **T"K** holds there is no maximum, and therefore when it is taken in any keili it can become kadosh, and he only mentions that it must be at least 3 lugin. **R' Elazar** holds that it cannot be more than 3 lugin, and therefore he is only chayuv if he took the water in a proper sized kli shareis in the proper amount of 3 lugin. **A2: R' Pappa** said, they argue regarding whether they brought nesachim in the Midbar. **R' Elazar** says they were not brought, which (based on drashos of pesukim) then means that he holds nesachim were never brought on private bamos. This means that nesachim were only brought in a kli shares. Therefore, he holds that one would only be chayuv if he brought

the nesachim outside after it was in a kli shareis. The **T"K** holds that nesachim were brought on private bamos, without a kli shares, and therefore one would be chayuv for bringing nesachim outside even if it was never put into a kli shares. **A3: Ravina** said, all agree that nesachim were brought in the Midbar, which means they were also brought on private bamos. The machlokes is whether we learn the pouring of the water from the pouring of the wine. The **T"K** says that we do, and therefore the person is chayuv even if the water was never put into a kli shareis, just as he would be for wine, and **R' Elazar** says that we don't, and therefore a person is only chayuv for pouring water outside when it was first put into a kli shareis.