

18 Sivan 5778
June 1, 2018



Zevachim Daf 49

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

How do we know that an asham offering requires (slaughtering in) the north? — Because it is written, in the place where they slaughter the olah shall they slaughter the asham.

We have thus found [it of] slaughtering; how do we know [it of] receiving? — [Because it is written,] And the blood thereof shall be thrown etc. [which teaches that] the receiving of its blood too must be in the north.

How do we know [that] the receiver himself [must stand in the north]? — ‘And its blood’ [is written where] ‘its blood’ [alone] would suffice.

We have thus found it as a recommendation: how do we know that it is indispensable? — Another verse is written: And he shall slaughter the lamb [in the place where they slaughter the chatas and the olah].

The Gemora asks: Now, does that come for the present purpose? Surely it is required for what was taught: If anything was included in a general proposition, and was then singled out for a new law, you cannot restore it to [the terms of] its general proposition, unless Scripture explicitly restores it to [the terms of] its general proposition. How so? [Scripture said,] And he shall slaughter the lamb in the place where they slaughter the chatas and the asham, in the place of the sanctuary; for as the chatas- so is the asham: it is the Kohen's; it is most holy. Now, ‘as the chatas so is the asham’ need not be said.

Why then is ‘as the chatas so is the asham’ said? Because a metzora's asham was singled out and made subject to a new law, viz., that in respect of the thumb of the hand, the big toe of the foot, and the right ear, you might think that it does not require the presentation of [its] blood and sacrificial parts at the altar; therefore Scripture says: ‘as the chatas so is the asham’: as the chatas requires the presentation of [its] blood and sacrificial parts at the altar, so does a metzora's asham require the presentation of blood and sacrificial parts at the ‘altar’

The Gemora answers: If so, let it be written in the latter [passage] and not in the former.

The Gemora objects: Now, that is well if we hold that when anything is made the subject of a new law, it cannot be learnt from its general law, but its general law can be learnt from it: then it is correct. But if we hold that neither can it be learnt from the general proposition, nor can the general proposition be learnt from it, then this [law] is required for its own purpose?

The Gemora answers: Since [Scripture] restored it, it restored it.

Mar Zutra son of Rav Mari said to Ravina: Yet say, when Scripture restored it [to the general proposition] [it was only] in respect of the presentation of the blood and sacrificial parts, since this requires Kehunah; but



slaughtering, which does not require Kehunah, does not require the north [either]?

The Gemora answers: If so, let Scripture say, 'for it is as the chatas': why [state], 'for as the chatas so is the asham'? [To teach:] Let it be like the other ashams.

The Gemora asks: Why must it be likened to both a chatas and an asham?

Ravina said: It is necessary: if it were likened to a chatas and were not likened to an asham, I would say: From where did we learn [that] a chatas [is slaughtered in the north]? From an olah: thus that which is learnt through a hekkesh in turn teaches through a hekkesh.

Mar Zutra the son of Rav Mari said to Ravina: Then let it be likened to an olah and not likened to a chatas?

Ravina answered: Then I would say, [that elsewhere] that which is learnt through a hekkesh in turn teaches through a hekkesh; and if you object: Then let it be likened to a chatas, [I could reply:] It [Scripture] prefers to liken it to the principal rather than to the secondary. Therefore it likened it to a chatas and it likened it to an olah, thus intimating that that which is learnt through a hekkesh does not in turn teach through a hekkesh.

Rava said: [It is learnt] from the following, for it is written: As is taken off from the ox of the sacrifice of a shelamim. For what purpose [is this written]? If for the diaphragm, the liver and the two kidneys (shall be removed from the Kohen Gadol's bull) [surely] that is written in the body of the text! But because [Scripture] wishes to intimate that [the burning of] the diaphragm, the liver and the two kidneys of the he-goats [brought as chatas-offerings] for idolatry shall be learnt by analogy from the communal-error bulls [for a chatas-offering on account] of [sinning in]

unawareness, whereas this law is not explicitly stated in the passage on the communal-error bull, but is learnt from the anointed Kohen's bull: therefore 'as is taken off' is required, so that it might count as written in that very passage and not as something which is learnt through a hekkesh and then in turn teaches through a hekkesh.

Rav Pappa said to Rava: Then let [Scripture] write it in its own context, and not assimilate [it to the anointed Kohen's bull]?

Rava answered: If [Scripture] wrote it in its own context, and did not teach it by assimilation, I would say: That which is learnt through a hekkesh can in turn teach through a hekkesh; and if you object: Then let Scripture assimilate it? [I could answer that Scripture] prefers to write it [explicitly] in its own context rather than to teach it through a hekkesh. Therefore [Scripture] wrote it and assimilated it, order to teach that that which is learnt through a hekkesh does not in turn teach through a hekkesh.