

3 Sivan 5778  
May 17, 2018



Zevachim Daf 34

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

**Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h**

**Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

### ***Tamei Eating Kodashim***

It was stated: If a *tamei* person ate sacrificial meat before the sprinkling of the blood, Rish Lakish maintained that he receives lashes, while Rabbi Yochanan ruled that he does not receive lashes.

Abaye said: This argument applies only to bodily *tumah*, but where the meat is *tamei*, all would agree that he receives lashes, because master said: It is written: *And the meat*. This includes wood and *levonah* (*frankincense*); though these are not edible, the Torah includes them. [*If these become tamei, a person receives lashes for eating them; certainly then, he will receive lashes for eating tamei meat before the sprinkling of the blood!*]

Rava said: The argument is in respect of bodily *tumah*, but where the meat is *tamei*, all would agree that he does not receive lashes. What is the reason for this? It is because we cannot apply to him the verse: Having his *tumah* upon him, that person shall suffer *kares* (*for that is referring only to meat after the blood was sprinkled*), you cannot apply to him the verse: *And the meat that touches any tamei thing shall not be eaten*.

The *Gemora* asks on Rava: But we learned, *And the meat*; this includes wood and *levonah*!?

The *Gemora* answers: That is where they were sanctified in a sacred vessel, so that they become as though all their

“permitters” had been performed. For we learned in a *Mishna*: All which have permitters, once their permitters have been offered (*a tamei person can incur kares for eating them*); whatever has no permitters, when it has been sanctified in a sacred vessel (*a tamei person can incur kares for eating them*). (34a)

### ***Offering Non-Kosher Animals***

It was stated: If one brings up the limbs of a non-kosher animal on the Altar, Rish Lakish maintains that he receives lashes, while Rabbi Yochanan said that he does not receive lashes.

The *Gemora* explains: Rish Lakish holds that he receives lashes for by saying, *a kosher animal*, the Torah implies that only a kosher animal may be offered, but not a non-kosher one and one receives lashes on account of a negative prohibition which is inferred from a positive commandment. Rabbi Yochanan said: He does not receive lashes, because one does not incur lashes on account of a negative prohibition which is inferred from a positive commandment.

Rabbi Yirmiyah asks on Rish Lakish from a *braisa*: It is written: [*And every animal that has a split hoof, which is completely separated into two hoof sections, and chews the cud among the animals -*] *that you may eat*. The implication from this verse is that such an animal you may

eat, but other animals (*that do not have these signs*) may not be eaten. And a prohibition derived from a positive commandment is regarded as a positive commandment.?  
(34a)

### **Offering wild Animals**

Rabbi Yaakov said to Rabbi Yirmiyah bar Tachlifa: I will explain the argument to you: There is no disagreement at all regarding the limbs of a non-kosher (*domesticated*) animal (*they both maintain that if such an animal is offered on the Altar, one does not receive lashes, for he has merely violated a positive commandment*); they disagree about a (*kosher*) wild animal (*such as a deer*), and the following is what was stated: Rabbi Yochanan said: He has transgressed a positive commandment. Rish Lakish said: He has not transgressed anything.

The *Gemora* explains: Rabbi Yochanan said: He transgresses a positive commandment, for (*by saying, from the cattle and the flock, the Torah implies that*) only a domesticated animal may be offered, but not a wild one; while Rish Lakish said that he does not transgress anything, for that verse only intimates that it is preferable (*to offer a domesticated animal, but in truth, a kosher wild animal may be offered as well*).

Rava asks on Rish Lakish from a *braisa*: If the torah would have stated: *an offering to Hashem, an animal*, I would have said that a wild animal is included in the animal category, as in the verse: *These are the animals which you may eat: the ox, the sheep, and the goat, the hart and the deer etc.* [Evidently, a deer is included in the general category of animal.] Therefore the Torah states: *from the cattle and the flock*. From the cattle or the flock have I told you (*that they can be offered*), but not a wild animal. You

might think that a wild animal should not be offered, yet if one did offer it, it is valid; for to what is this law compared to? It may be likened to a disciple whom his teacher told him, "Bring me wheat" and he went and brought him wheat and barley, where he is not regarded as having transgressed his words, but rather, as having added to them, and it is valid; therefore the Torah writes: *from the cattle and the flock*. From the cattle or the flock have I told you (*that they can be offered*), but not a wild animal. To what is this law compared to? It may be likened to a disciple whom his teacher told him, "Bring me nothing but wheat," and he brought him wheat and barley. He is not regarded as having added to his words, but as transgressing them, and therefore the offering (*of the wild animal*) is invalid. This indeed refutes the opinion of Rish Lakish. (34a – 34b)

### **More Lifeblood**

Rish Lakish inquires of Rabbi Yochanan: Does a disqualified person (*who performed the sprinkling of the blood onto the Altar*) render (*the blood in the neck*) remnantats? [*If he sprinkles the blood, can a qualified person make the sacrifice valid by receiving more blood from the animal's neck and sprinkling it? Or do we say that once the unqualified person has sprinkled the blood, the blood that still remains in the neck is regarded as the remnants of the blood, which cannot be used for sprinkling, and therefore the sacrifice is invalid? (The Mishna, which ruled that if there is lifeblood, it is still valid, speaks only of a case when the disqualified person accepted the blood, not of sprinkling.)*]

Rabbi Yochanan said to him: There is no case of sprinkling that renders the blood (*in the animal's neck*) remnantats except in a case where it was done with the improper intention of beyond its time or outside of its place, since it

effects (*the invalidation of the korban*) with respect of *piggul*.

Rav Zevid reported the discussion as follows: Does a *Kohen* who sprinkled a cup of disqualified blood (*if it left the Courtyard*) render (*the blood in the neck*) remnants?

Rabbi Yochanan said to him: What is your opinion about a disqualified person himself? If a disqualified person renders the blood remnants, then a cup of disqualified blood renders the blood remnant as well; if a disqualified person does not render the blood remnants, then a cup of disqualified blood does not render the blood remnants as well.

Rav Yirmiyah of Difti reported it as follows: Abaye inquired of Rabbah: Does one cup (*in a case of a chatas that its blood was accepted with two vessels, and only one of them was used for the blood applications*) render its fellow (*cup*) rejected (*which, like any rejected blood, is spilled into the canal that ran through the Temple Courtyard; it was then channeled into the Kidron Valley*) or remnants (*and it is poured onto the base of the Altar – just as what was done with the remaining blood in the cup which was used to apply the blood*)?

He replied to him: This is the subject of a dispute between Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Shimon and the Rabbis. For it was taught in a *braisa*: Above (*by the Nasi's korban*) it is written: *And its (remaining) blood shall be poured out (at the base of the Altar)*; while below (*by an individual's chatas*) it is written: *And all the (remaining) blood shall be poured out (at the base of the Altar)*. How do we know that if the *Kohen* accepted the blood of the *chatas* in four cups and made one application from each, the entire remainder is poured out at the base of the Altar? It is from the verse: *And all the (remaining) blood shall be poured out (at the base of the Altar)*. You might think that if he made the four

applications from one cup, the entire remainder is to be poured out at the base of the Altar; therefore the verse states: *And its (remaining) blood (but not all the blood)*. What should be done? The remaining blood of that cup is poured out at the base, but the other cups are poured out into the canal. Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Shimon said: From where do we know that if the *Kohen* accepted the blood of the *chatas* in four cups and made the four applications from one cup, the entire remainder is to be poured out at the base of the Altar? It is from the verse: *And all the (remaining) blood shall be poured out (at the base of the Altar)*.

The *Gemora* asks: But surely it is written: *And its (remaining) blood (but not all the blood)!*?

Rav Ashi answers: That is to exclude the remainder of the blood left in the neck of the animal. (34b)

### **Necessary Cases**

The *Mishna* had stated: If a qualified person received the blood and gave it to an unqualified one etc. (*he may give it back to a qualified one; the same is true regarding a case where he put it in his left hand, of if he placed it into a non-sacred vessel*).

The *Gemora* notes that all these cases are necessary; for if we were taught about an unqualified person, I would say that we are referring only to a *tamei* person who is eligible for public service (*and that is why he may return it to a qualified person*), but when it was placed into his left hand, it is not so. And if we were taught about the left hand, that is because it is fit on Yom Kippur (*when the Kohen Gadol brought the spoon filled with ketores into the Holy of Holies*), but when it was placed into a non-sacred vessel, it is not so. And if we were taught about non-sacred vessels, that is because they are eligible to be sanctified, but as for

the others, I would say that it is not so. Therefore, they are all necessary. (34b)

### **Rejection**

The Gemora asks: But let it be regarded as rejected (since the blood was initially fit and then it was pushed aside, it should be permanently rejected)!?

Ravina said to Rav Ashi: Rabbi Yirmiyah of Difti said in the name of Rava: This is in accordance with Chanan the Egyptian, who does not accept the law of rejection, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Chanan the Egyptian said (regarding the two goats of Yom Kippur, where the slaughtering of the chatas goat and the sprinkling of its blood is not valid unless the goat being sent to Azazel is still alive): Even if the blood (of the chatas goat) is in the cup (before it was sprinkled, and the Azazel goat died), he brings another goat and pairs it (with this one; we do not say that the blood is permanently rejected).

Rav Ashi answered: When it is within one's power (to rectify the matter), it does not become permanently rejected.

Rav Shaya noted: Logic supports Rav Ashi, for who is the *Tanna* that accepts the principle of rejection? It is Rabbi Yehudah, as we learned in a *Mishna*: Even more so did Rabbi Yehudah say: If the blood of the (chatas) goat spilled, the goat which was to be sent away is left to die (for it is permanently rejected; two new goats must be chosen); if the goat which was to be sent away died, the blood of the other one must be spilled out. Yet we know that Rabbi Yehudah rules that where it is within one's power (to rectify the matter), there is no rejection, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Yehudah said: The *Kohen* used to fill a cup with the mingled blood (from all the pesach offerings, including blood that might have spilled

before the sprinkling, which would cause that the owner of this korban did not fulfill his obligation) and sprinkle it once against the base of the Altar (the location where the blood from all pesach offerings are applied; this is valid, for we assume that this cup of blood will contain at least a drop of the spilled blood). This proves that where it is within one's power to rectify the matter (like here, where he can gather the blood from the floor and apply it to the Altar), there is no rejection. This indeed proves it. (34b)

### **INSIGHTS TO THE DAF**

#### **Where Is the Sheep for an 'Olah?**

By: Meoros HaDaf HaYomi

At the time of his sacrifice, why did Yitzchak ask Avraham "where is the sheep for an 'olah?" only when they approached Mount Moriah? Because at first he didn't know that they were going to the site of the Temple. On a *bamah* (an Altar not included in the Sanctuary or the Temple) it was allowed to sacrifice wild (kosher) animals (Zevachim 115b). When they approached the site of the Temple, where only cattle, sheep and goats are sacrificed, he asked "where is the sheep for an 'olah?" (*Minchas Asher, Vayeira*).