



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

Zevachim Daf Kuf Yud Beis

GEMARA

- **Q:** It makes sense that he is chayuv if he first applies the blood outside and then applies it inside, because the blood applied outside is fit to be applied inside. However, if he first applies the blood inside and then outside, the blood applied outside is leftover blood, and he should therefore not be chayuv for that!? **A:** The Mishna follows the view of **R' Nechemya**, who says that one is chayuv for applying leftover blood outside.
 - **Q:** The next part of the Mishna says that if the blood was in two keilim and he applied the blood of one keili inside and of the second one outside, he is patur. Now, if the Mishna follows **R' Nechemya**, he should be chayuv in that case as well!? **A:** This part of the Mishna follows the view of the **T"K** who argues on **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** and holds that when the blood of one keili is applied it makes the blood in the other keili to be considered as "rejected", making it unfit to be applied inside. We can see from here that this **T"K** is **R' Nechemya**.

LEMAH HADAVAR DOMEH...

- **Q:** Why did the Mishna need to give us a comparison? **A:** The Mishna follows the view of **Rebbi**, who says that even if a chatas is lost at the time that its replacement is designated, it is left to die. The Mishna is saying that the reason he is patur when he shechted the second one outside is because the first one was lost and this second one therefore becomes passul when the first one was shechted inside. However, if a person initially designated two animals for his chatas, to have a guarantee in case something happens to the first one, the halacha is that the one that remains becomes an olah (it is left to graze, get a mum, and is then sold, with the proceeds used to purchase an olah), and therefore if it is shechted outside the person would be chayuv. We find that **R' Huna in the name of Rav** says this as well, that an ashm that has been sent for grazing, to get a mum, and to be sold with the proceeds to be used for an olah, and the ashm is then shechted without specific intent, it gets the status of an olah.
 - **Q:** The case of **R' Huna** is very different, because an ashm is brought from a male animal and an olah is brought from a male animal. However, a chatas is brought from a female animal, and therefore cannot become an olah!? **A:** **R' Chiya of Miyustinya** said, the Mishna is referring to the goat chatas of the Nasi, which is a chatas brought from a male animal.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HASHOCHET V'HAMAALAH!!!

PEREK PARAS CHATAS -- PEREK ARBA'AH ASSAR

MISHNA

- If the parah adumah was burned outside of its pit (which was made for it to be burned on Har Hazeisim), or if the goat to be sent to the Azazel was offered up outside the Azarah, the person who did so would be patur. This is based on the pasuk of "v'ehl pesach Ohel Moed lo havi'o", which teaches that anything that is not fit to be brought to the entrance of the Ohel Moed would not make someone chayuv for offering them outside.
 - An animal that sodomized a person, an animal that was sodomized by a man, an animal that was designated to be used for avoda zara, an animal that was worshipped as avoda zara, an animal that was exchanged for a dog, an animal that was the payment of a zonah, an animal of kilayim, an animal that was a treifah, or an animal that was born via Caesarean section, which one offered up outside the Azarah, would not make the person chayuv. This is learned from the pasuk of "lifnei Mishkan Hashem", which

teaches that something that is not fit to be brought as a korbán to Hashem would not make someone chayuv for his offering it up outside.

- An animal that has a mum, whether it is a permanent mum or a temporary mum, that was offered outside, the person who does so will be patur. **R' Shimon** says, if it had a permanent mum he would be patur, but if it had a temporary mum he would be chayuv for being oiver a lav.
- With regard to “torim” (type of bird used for a korbán) that were too young to be used, or “bnei yonah” (another type of bird used for a korbán) that were too old to be used, that were offered outside, he would be patur. **R' Shimon** says, if he offered bnei yonah that were too old he would be patur, but if he offered torim that were too young he would be chayuv for being oiver a lav.
- With regard to an animal and its offspring (which may not be shechted on the same day, and therefore if one was shechted and the other was then offered outside), or an animal that is missing time to be valid for a korbán, he would be patur. **R' Shimon** says, he would be chayuv for being oiver a lav. **R' Shimon's** view (in all the above) is that anything that will be fit to be brought as a korbán in the future is now subject to a lav for offering it outside, but is not subject to kares. The **Chachomim** say that anything that is not subject to kares (for offering it outside) would also not be subject to a lav.
- When the Mishna discussed that one who offered outside an animal that “is missing time to be valid”, this refers to whether the animal itself was not yet ready to be offered as a korbán (it had not yet reached the age of 8 days old), or to where the owner was not yet ready to bring the korbán. What is a case of an owner who is not ready to bring his korbán? A zav, zavah, woman who has given birth, or a metzora, who offered their chatas and ashám outside the Azarah before the time that they were able to bring their korbán, in which case they would be patur. However, if they offered their olah or shelamim outside, they would be chayuv (since they would be valid as voluntary korbanos).
- If one offers outside the meat of the chatas, or the meat of the ashám, or the meat of other kodshei kodashim, or the meat of kodshei kalim, or the leftover of the Omer, or the Shteí Halechem, or the Lechem Hapanim, or the leftover of a mincha, or if one poured oil onto a mincha, or breaks it into pieces, or mixes the flour with the oil, or one who salts a korbán, or does tenufah on it, or did hagasha (the requirement to bring the mincha close to the Mizbe'ach), or set up the Lechem Hapanim on the Shulchan, or if he cleans out the menorah and prepares it, or takes a kometz from a mincha, or if one does a kabbalah – in all these cases if he did it outside the Azarah, he is patur.
 - Also, with regard to any of these acts, a non-Kohen would not be chayuv for doing them, a person would not be chayuv for doing them when tamei, or for not wearing the bigdei kehuna, or for not having washed his hands or feet.
- Until the Mishkan was put up it was mutar to have a bamah, and the Avodah on the bamah was done by the bechorim. Once the Mishkan was put up it became assur to bring a korbán on a bamah, and all the Avodah was only done by Kohanim, kodshei kodashim could only be eaten within the Azarah, and kodshei kalim could only be eaten anywhere in the Machaneh Yisrael.
 - When the Yidden reached Gilgal, bamos again became mutar, but kodshei kodashim could only be eaten inside the Azarah, and kodshei kalim could be eaten anywhere.
 - When the Yidden reached Shiloh, bamos again became assur. There was no permanent roof on the Mishkan in Shiloh, rather the rest of the structure was built of stone and the roof was made of material. Shiloh is the place referred to as “menuchah” in the Torah. Kodshei kodashim had to be eaten within the Azarah and kodshei kalim and maaser sheini could be eaten anywhere within sight of Shiloh.
 - When the Yidden reached Nov and Givon, bamos again became mutar. Kodshei kodashim had to be eaten within the Azarah and kodshei kalim could be eaten in all the cities of EY.
 - When the Yidden came to Yerushalayim, bamos again became assur and never again became mutar. Yerushalayim is the “nachalah” referred to in the Torah. Kodshei kodashim had to be eaten inside the Azarah, and kodshei kalim and maaser sheini had to be eaten within the walls of Yerushalayim.
- Any korbán that was made kadosh at a time when bamos were assur and was then offered outside the Azarah at a time when bamos were assur, are subject to an assei, a lo saasei, and a

chiyuv kares. If a korbon was made kadosh when bamos were mutar and was then offered outside the Azarah at a time when bamos were assur, are subject to an assei, and a lo saasei, but there is no chiyuv kares. If a korbon was made kadosh at a time when bamos were assur and was then offered outside at a time when bamos were mutar, they are subject to an assei, but not to a lo saasei.

- The following korbanos had to be offered in the Mishkan even when bamos were mutar: korbanos that were made kodesh for the Mishkan and korbanos tzibbur. The korbon of an individual could be offered on a bamah. If an individual's korbon was made kodesh for the Mishkan, it had to be offered in the Mishkan, but if it was offered on a bamah he would be patur.
 - What is the difference between the bamah of an individual and the bamah of the tzibbur? Smicha, shechting in the north, and blood applications all around are only done at the bamah of the tzibbur. With regard to tenufah, hagashah (bringing a mincha to the Mizbe'ach) – although **R' Yehuda** holds that a mincha could not be brought on a bamah – the requirement that the Avodah be done by a Kohen, that it be done with bigdei kehunah, with klei shareis, that it bring a "reyach nicho'ach", that it have a line at the midway point of the height, and that the person wash his hands and feet, also only apply to the bamah of the tzibbur. However, the psul of intent for beyond its time, of nossar, and of tamei, even apply to the bamah of an individual.