



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

Zevachim Daf Kuf Yud Gimmel

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is meant when the Mishna refers to burning the parah adumah "outside of its pit"? **A:** **Reish Lakish** said, it means it was done outside the area that had been checked to assure that there is no tumas meis there. **R' Yochanan** said, that can't be correct, because all of EY is considered to be checked. Rather, the Mishna refers to a case where the parah adumah was burned inside Yerushalayim.
 - **Q:** Why doesn't he explain the case as referring to where it was shechted outside Yerushalayim, but not opposite the opening to the Heichal, which **R' Ada bar Ahava** learns from a hekesh is necessary for the parah adumah to be valid!? You can't say that **R' Yochanan** doesn't darshen this hekesh, because we find that he explicitly does darshen this hekesh to teach this halacha!? **A:** **R' Yochanan** is saying that certainly if it was shechted in the wrong place outside Yerushalayim it would be passul, but the Mishna is saying even more, that if it was shechted inside Yerushalayim, even though it is closer to the Heichal and we would therefore possibly think that it should be valid, it will also be passul.
 - **Q:** What is the point of machlokes between **R' Yochanan** and **Reish Lakish**? **A:** **Reish Lakish** holds that the Mabul was in EY as well (and we must be concerned that there are people buried deep underground from the Mabul), whereas **R' Yochanan** holds that there was no Mabul in EY. They actually both darshen the same pasuk, but darshen it differently, with these differing results.
 - **Q:** A Mishna describes the process of how certain children were raised in environments that precluded the possibility of the child becoming tamei from a meis, and these tahor children would draw water for the parah adumah process, if needed. The Mishna says, when going to the stream to draw the water, the child would be transported on a board over the back of an ox, so that the board would act as an ohel over the ground, just in case there was a meis buried at some point along the way, and tells of additional ways in which they made sure to protect them and the water from tumas meis. We clearly see that there was a concern for tumas meis in EY as well!? **A:** **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, this was all done as an added chumra for parah adumah, but by strict halacha it did not have to be done.
 - **Q:** **R' Yochanan** asked, a Braisa says that they once found human bones in the wood storage area of the Beis Hamikdash and they therefore wanted to be goizer tumah on all of Yerushalayim. **R' Yehoshua** stood up and said, that that would be a disgrace! He said – where are the dead of the Mabul, and where are the dead of Nevuchadnetzar (none of these dead were ever found in EY)!? We see from here that the Mabul didn't exist in EY!? **A:** **Reish Lakish** said, can it be said that the dead of Nevuchadnetzar were not in EY? Of course they were! Rather, it means that they were there and moved away. The same can be said about the dead of the Mabul.
 - **Q:** Still, this would seem to show that they have been moved away, which means that EY is free of tumah!? **A:** They were moved away from Yerushalayim, but not from the rest of EY. Therefore, since the parah adumah was done outside Yerushalayim, the place of its Avodah had to be checked for tumah.
 - **Others** said that it was **Reish Lakish** who asked based on **R' Yehoshua**, that since we know the dead of Nevuchadnetzar were there, it must be

that he was saying that the dead of the Mabul were there as well!? **A: R' Yochanan** answered, it may be that the dead of Nevuchadnetzar were there, but the dead of the Mabul were not.

- **Q: Reish Lakish** asked, “The pasuk says that everything that was on dry land died. This seems to include even the living things in EY. Now, according to me the reason the living things in EY died is because the Mabul was there. However, according to you, why did they die?” **A:** The Gemara explains, they died because of the extreme heat, as **R' Chisda** learns from a pasuk.
 - **Others** say that **R' Yochanan** asked based on this pasuk. “The pasuk says that everything on the *dry land* died. According to me there was dry land, because EY didn't have the Mabul. However, according to you, where was there dry land!?” **Reish Lakish** said, “It refers to the living things on the areas that used to be dry land.” This is like **R' Chisda** said, that the fish did not die.
- **Q:** There is a humongous animal called the “re'eim” which survived the Mabul although it was too large to fit into the teiva. According to **R' Yochanan** we can say that it survived by going to EY, but according to **Reish Lakish** how did it survive? **A: R' Yannai** said, there were baby re'eim that were brought into the teiva that survived.
 - **Q: Rabbah bar bar Chana** said that he saw a baby re'eim, and it was tremendous (way too large to fit into the teiva)!? **A: R' Yochanan** said, its head went into the teiva.
 - **Q:** Even its head was too large to fit!? **A:** Rather, the tip of its nose went into the teiva, and that is how it survived.
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** said there was no Mabul in EY, so why is he giving another way for the re'eim to have survived? **A:** He is answering according to the view of **Reish Lakish**.
 - **Q:** The teiva's movement would cause its nose to slip out!? **A: Reish Lakish** said, it dug its horns into the teiva to stay in place.
 - **Q: R' Chisda** said that the water was boiling water, so how did it survive!? **A:** We see that the teiva didn't burn up, and that Og Melech Habashan survived in the water. There was a miracle that the side of the teiva remained cool, and that is how all these survived.
- **Q:** We find that **Reish Lakish** said that all the dead of the Mabul ended up settling in Bavel!? **A:** Most did, but some must have become rooted in EY as they rolled down to Bavel.

SA'IR HAMISHTALEI'ACH

- **Q:** Our Mishna says that the goat sent to the Azazel is excluded from the chiyuv for one who shechts it outside, because it is not fit to be brought “ehl pesach Ohel Moed”. However, a Braisa says different. The Braisa says, the pasuk that forbids shechting a korbon outside the Azarah says “v'ehl pesach Ohel Moed lo hevio l'hakriv korbon LaShem”. The word “korbon” alone would suggest that even bedek habayis animals are included in the prohibition (they are referred to as “korbon” as well). The pasuk therefore says “v'ehl pesach Ohel Moed...” The prohibition only applies to animals that are fit to be brought to the entrance of the Ohel Moed. Still, this would suggest that the Azazel goat is included (because it is brought to the entrance for the gorel and for the semicha process). The pasuk therefore says “LaShem”, which teaches that only korbanos offered to Hashem are included. We see the Braisa bases this on the word “LaShem”!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to the goat before the gorel is done, whereas the Mishna is referring to the goat after the gorel was done.
 - **Q:** Even after the gorel the goat is still fit to be at the pesach Ohel Moed for the viduy of the Kohen Gadol!? **A:** Rather, **R' Mani** said, the Braisa is referring to the goat before the viduy is done, whereas the Mishna is referring to the goat after the viduy was done.