



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

### Zevachim Daf Kuf Tes Vuv

- **Q:** The Gemara said that **R' Chilkiya bar Tuvi** holds that if a person shechted an ashm that had not yet reached its time, not lishma, outside the Azarah, he is chayuv. The Gemara now says, maybe we can bring proof for this from a Braisa which says, we would think to exclude from the chiyuv for shechting outside, even an olah that is premature because of its owner (e.g. the olah of a metzora or woman who gave birth, and who can't go into the Azarah and can't yet fulfil their obligation with this korbon), or the ashm of a nazir or of a metzora. The pasuk therefore says the extra words of "shor, kesev, and eiz". Now, the Braisa includes the case of ashm but does not include a chatas. What is the case that the Braisa is referring to? It can't be where the ashm is brought in its proper time, because he would be chayuv for a chatas as well! Therefore, it must be referring to when it is brought before its proper time. Now, it can't be referring to where the ashm was brought lishmo, because then he would not be chayuv! Rather, it must be that it was brought not lishmo, and we see that a person is chayuv for the shechting outside of a premature ashm that was shechted not lishmo! **A:** The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. The Braisa may be referring to where the ashm was not premature, and it was shechted not lishmo, and the Braisa follows **R' Eliezer**, who says that we learn ashm from chatas, that an ashm shechted not lishmo is also passul. However, since if it would be brought inside without specific intent it would be valid, if it is brought outside he is chayuv (even though he brought it shelo lishmo).
  - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from a Braisa which says, we would think to include in the chiyuv for shechting outside, even an olah that is premature because of itself (it is not yet 8 days old), and a chatas that is premature either because of itself or because of its owner, the pasuk therefore says "v'ehl pesach Ohel Moed", which teaches that something that is not fit to be brought to the Mikdash would not make one chayuv for shechting it outside. Now, the Braisa did not discuss an ashm. What is the case of the Braisa? It can't be referring to where the korbon was offered lishmo, because then the Braisa should list an ashm as well as being patur! Rather, it is referring to where it is brought not lishmo, and that is why it doesn't list ashm as being patur, because he would be chayuv for the premature ashm brought outside when it is brought not lishmo! **A:** The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. The Braisa may be referring to where the ashm was shechted not lishmo, and the Braisa follows **R' Eliezer**, who says that we learn ashm from chatas, that an ashm shechted not lishmo is also passul.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from **R' Dimi**, who said that the yeshiva of **Bar Liva'i** taught a Braisa which, as the Braisa quoted above, says we would think to exclude from the chiyuv for shechting outside, even an olah that is premature because of its owner (e.g. the olah of a metzora or woman who gave birth, and who can't go into the Azarah and can't yet fulfil their obligation with this korbon), or the ashm of a nazir or of a metzora. **Ravina** said, the Braisa says that the pasuk therefore says the extra words of "shor, kesev, and eiz". Now, the Braisa includes the case of ashm but does not include a chatas. As we said above, the Braisa must be referring to where it was brought not lishmo, and we see that a person is chayuv for the shechting outside of a premature ashm that was shechted not lishmo!
    - **Q:** The Gemara asks, we have already explained how to interpret such a Braisa as referring to where the ashm was not premature, and it was shechted not lishmo, and the Braisa follows **R' Eliezer**!? **A:** **R' Nachman** said, the Gemara is bringing its proof from a contradiction between this Braisa and a Braisa taught by the yeshiva of **Levi**, which says that an ashm of a nazir or a metzora that are shechted not lishma are valid but don't fulfil the obligation of the owner. If it is

shechted premature because of the owner, or if they were past the age of when they could be brought as an asham, they are passul. This suggests that if a premature asham was shechted outside, the person would be patur. **R' Dimi** answered this contradiction by saying that the Braisa of **Levi** refers to where it was shechted lishmo and the Braisa of **Leiva'I** refers to where it was shechted not lishmo (and is therefore fit to be brought in the Azarah). We see that **R' Dimi** understood the Braisa of **Leiva'I** as referring to where the asham was premature, and is therefore a proof to **R' Chilkiya bar Tuvi!**

- **Q:** Should we say that this is a TEYUFTA of **R' Huna** (who argues on **R' Chilkiya bar Tuvi**)? **A:** **R' Huna** could say that the Braisa is dealing with a case where a person designated 2 ashamos, as a guarantee (and then shechted one prematurely outside for the sake of an olah). In this case this olah is fit to be brought in the Azarah because the halacha is that when 2 ashamos are designated in this way, one of them is an olah from the very beginning, as is stated by **R' Huna in the name of Rav.**

#### HAMAALAH M'BSAR CHATAS...

- A Braisa says, how do we know that one who offers the meat of a chatas or of an asham, or of kodshei kodashim, or of kodshei kalim, or of the leftovers of the Omer, or of the Shteit Halechem, or of the Lechem Hapanim, or of the leftover of a mincha, is patur? The pasuk regarding offering outside says "olah". This teaches that just as an olah is fit to be brought up onto the Mizbe'ach, so too one is chayuv only for things that are fit to be brought up onto the Mizbe'ach. How do we know that also one who pours oil on a mincha, mixes the oil and the flour, breaks the mincha into pieces, salts a korbon, does tenufah, does hagasha, sets up the Lechem Hapanim on the Shulchan, prepares the Menorah, takes a kometz, or does kabbalah, in each case outside the Azarah, is also patur? The pasuk says "asher yaaleh olah oy zavach", which teaches that just as bringing up onto the Mizbe'ach is the final avodah to be done, so too one is only chayuv outside for an act that is the final avodah to be done.

#### AHD SHELO HUKAM HAMISHKAN...

- **Q: R' Huna bar R' Katina** was sitting by **R' Chisda** and said that **R' Assi** said that the bechorim did the Avodah only at Har Sinai. Immediately after that the Kohanim began to do the Avodah. **R' Chisda** was going to refute this based on our Mishna (that says the bechorim did the Avodah until the Mishkan was built), but he then heard that **R' Huna** in the name of **R' Ada bar Ahava** said that the olah that was brought by the Yidden in the Midbar did not need to be skinned and cut into pieces. **R' Chisda** then decided to refute both of these statements from one Braisa which explicitly says that bamos were mutar until the Mishkan was built and that the bechorim did the Avodah until the Mishkan was built. The Braisa gives other rulings, among them is the ruling that the olah that the Yidden brought in the Midbar did need to be skinned and cut into pieces. The Braisa refutes **R' Huna!** **A:** The Gemara says, the question of who did the Avodah until the Mishkan was built is actually a machlokes Tanna'im (so the Braisa therefore can't refute **R' Huna**). A Braisa says that **R' Yehoshua ben Korcha** says that the pasuk that warns that the Kohanim should stay away from Har Sinai refers to the bechorim (they were the "kohanim" at that time, until the Mishkan) and **Rebbi** says it refers to Nadav and Avihu (they took over as the kohanim from that point in time, which is what **R' Huna** said).
  - **Q:** According to **Rebbi** we can understand that pasuk to mean that Nadav and Avihu were warned before doing the act that brought about their deaths (it is this warning at Har Sinai, which was directed to them). However, according to **R' Yehoshua**, where were they warned? **A:** It is the pasuk that says that the Mishkan will be made holy "bichvodai", which we darshen as saying "bichvodai" (through the deaths of My honored ones). Based on this, when Nadav and Avihu died, Moshe told Aharon that his sons had died only to make a Kiddush Hashem. Upon hearing that, Aharon remained silent ("vayidom Aharon"), and he received reward for doing so. We find that Dovid in Tehillim also discusses the importance of remaining silent in the face of Judgment, and Shlomo does the same in a pasuk in Mishlei.
  - **Q:** How do we answer the fact that the Braisa says that the olah that the Yidden brought in the Midbar needed to be skinned and cut into pieces? **A:** This too is a matter of machlokes among Tanna'im in a Braisa where **R' Yishmael** says that only the general principles of the mitzvos were taught at Sinai, but the details were not taught until later

- on at the Mishkan (which would mean the details of skinning and cutting into pieces were not taught until then). **R' Akiva** says that even the details were taught at Sinai.
- The Braisa quoted above said that all types of animals were allowed to be brought as korbanos before the Mishkan was built. **R' Huna** said we learn this from the pasuk regarding Noach which says 'vayiven Noach Mizbe'ach La'Hashem vayikach mikol habeheima hatehorah umikol ha'of hatahor".
    - The word "beheima" refers to a domesticated animal, and also includes chayos as well.
    - The Braisa says that they were also allowed to bring males and females, without mumin and even with mumin. This is based on the fact that there is no requirement of gender or of not having a mum for a bird, and the pasuk makes a hekesh from birds to animals.
      - Although it could have a mum, it could not be missing a limb. **R' Elazar** explains, the pasuk regarding the bringing of the animals into the teiva says "umikol hachai mikol basar shnayim mikol..." which teaches that Bnei Noach cannot bring a korbon that is missing a limb.
        - **Q:** That pasuk is needed to exclude the bringing of a treifa into the teiva, and is therefore not available to exclude animals that area missing a limb!? **A:** A treifa is excluded from the pasuk of "l'chayos zerah".
        - **Q:** That makes sense according to the view that a treifa cannot give birth. However, what about the view that a treifa can give birth? **A:** That view would say that a treifa is excluded by the word "itach", which teaches that the animals had to be like Noach, who was not a treifa.
        - **Q:** Maybe Noach was a treifa? **A:** The pasuk says he was "tamim" (complete).
        - **Q:** Maybe "tamim" refers to his ways? **A:** The pasuk says he was a tzaddik, so that already teaches that he was complete in his ways.
        - **Q:** Maybe "tamim" refers to his ways and "tzaddik" refers to his deeds? **A:** It can't be that Noach was a treifa, because then when Hashem said to take in animals "like you" He meant that only animals that were treifos should be brought into the teiva. That does not make sense.
        - **Q:** If we exclude treifos based on "itach", why do we need the pasuk of "l'chayos zerah"? **A:** From "itach" we would think to exclude a treifa only so that they don't die during the year in the teiva and can provide companionship for Noach, but an old or sterile animal would be ok. The pasuk therefore says "l'chayos zerah" to teach that the animal must be able to have offspring.