



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Zevachim, Daf 77 – Daf 78

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf 77---34-----

- A Braisa (partially quoted above) says, if a tamei person ate from the meat of a korban before the zrika, **Reish Lakish** says he gets malkus and **R' Yochanan** says he does not.
 - **Abaye** said, the machlokes is only in regard to where the person is tamei, but if the meat was tamei and the person was tahor all would agree that he would get malkus even if he ate it before the zrika. We see this from the fact that the pasuk of "v'habasar" is darshened to teach that even wood or levonah, which are not edible, that become tamei and are then eaten are assur and carry malkus. If they are assur with malkus, then certainly eating tamei meat before the zrika, which is edible, is assur with malkus. **Rava** said, the machlokes is only in regard to where the person is tamei, but if the meat was tamei and the person was tahor all would agree that he would not get malkus if he ate it before the zrika. He said that we learn this from a hekesh of a tamei person getting malkus for eating kodesh meat – which only applies after the zrika – to a tahor person eating tamei meat – which therefore also only applies after the zrika.
 - **Q:** How will **Rava** explain **Abaye's** proof? **A:** He will say that one only gets malkus for eating tamei wood or levonah of kodesh if they were placed into a kli shareis, because doing so gives them the status as if the zrika was done for them (these items don't have an associated zrika, and this acts as their "permitter"). We see this concept in a Mishna.
- If a person offers up the limbs of a non-kosher animal on the Mizbe'ach, **Reish Lakish** says he gets malkus and **R' Yochanan** says he does not. **Reish Lakish** says, that the fact that the Torah says a kosher animal may be offered teaches that a non-kosher animal may not be offered, and a lav that is learned from an assei carries the malkus penalty. **R' Yochanan** says, that such a lav does not carry the malkus penalty.
 - **Q:** **R' Yirmiya** asked, a Braisa says there is no malkus for eating a non-kosher animal, because it is a lav that is learned from an assei, and therefore does not carry malkus. This contradicts **Reish Lakish**!? **A:** **R' Yaakov** said to **R' Yirmiya bar Tachlifa**, with regard to one who offers the limbs of a non-kosher animal on the Mizbe'ach all would agree that he does not get malkus. The machlokes is regarding one who offers the limbs of a kosher "chaya" on the Mizbe'ach – **R' Yochanan** says he has violated an assei, because the Torah says one can offer a "beheima" which teaches that he may not offer a chaya, and **Reish Lakish** says he has not violated anything, because the teaching to offer a beheima is only to teach that that is preferable.
 - **Q:** **Rava** asked, a Braisa darshens psukim and clearly says that an offering of a chaya as a korban is passul! This is a **TEYUFTA** of **Reish Lakish**!

V'KULAN SHEKIBLU...

- **Q:** **Reish Lakish** asked **R' Yochanan**, if a passul person did kabbalah and zrika, does that also make any remaining lifeblood in the animal passul as well, or may a valid Kohen go and do a kabbalah and zrika with other lifeblood from the animal and make the korban valid? **A:** **R' Yochanan** said, the only zrika that makes the remaining lifeblood passul is a zrika with intent for beyond its time or place, because the zrika in that case makes the korban into piggul.
 - **R' Zvid** said that **Reish Lakish** asked, if a Kohen throws a cup of passul blood does it make the remaining lifeblood passul? **R' Yochanan** answered, from your question it must be that you know the halacha if a passul Kohen does the zrika, whether that makes the remaining lifeblood passul. If the passul Kohen makes it passul, the cup of passul blood would also make it passul, and if the passul Kohen does not, then the cup of passul blood would also not make it passul.
 - **R' Yirmiya MiDifti** said that **Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, if the Kohen was mekabel the blood in two cups and one was used for zrika, is the blood in the remaining cup considered to be rejected and should therefore

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

be spilled out, or is it considered to be “shirayim” in which case it should be poured onto the base of the Mizbe’ach? **Rabbah** said, this is the subject of a machlokes between **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Shimon** and the **Rabanan** in a Braisa, where the **Rabanan** say that the blood in the other cup is spilled out and **R’ Elazar** says it is poured on the base of the Mizbe’ach.

KIBEIL HAKASHER V’NOSSAN LAPASSUL...

- The Mishna gave 3 examples – 1) if a valid Kohen did the kabbalah and then gave the blood to a passul, he should then give it back to the valid person who can then continue with the avodah; 2) if he did the kabbalah with his right hand and then transferred it to his left hand, he should give it back to his right hand; and 3) if he did the kabbalah in a kli shareis and then transferred it to a regular keili, he should put it back into a kli shareis. The Gemara says that all 3 examples are needed. If we only had the case of the passul we would say it is referring to a Kohen who is tamei and the reason he doesn’t make it passul by holding it is because a tamei is valid for the avodah of the tzibbur, but other types of pessulim make it passul. If we only had the case of the left hand we would say, that case is valid because there is part of an avodah on Yom Kippur that is done with the left hand, but the case of the regular keili should be passul. If we only had the case of the regular keili we would say, that case is valid because the keili is fit to become a kli shareis. This is why all 3 examples are necessary.
- **Q:** Why don’t we say that the blood becomes rejected in these cases? **A:** **Ravina** said to **R’ Ashi** that **R’ Yirmiya MiDifti in the name of Rava** said the Mishna follows the view of **Chanan HaMitzri**, who does not hold of the concept of rejection. **A2:** **R’ Ashi** said, it may be that the Mishna holds of the concept of rejection. However, anything that becomes passul, but is within one’s power to change (the passul can give it back to the valid Kohen, it can be moved from the left hand back to the right, etc.), does not cause it to become rejected.
 - **R’ Shaya** said, the answer of **R’ Ashi** seems correct. We find in a Mishna where **R’ Yehuda** holds of the concept of rejection, and we find in a Braisa where **R’ Yehuda** holds that on Erev Pesach the Kohen takes a cup of blood from the floor and throws it on the Mizbe’ach. This shows that he holds that something that becomes passul, but is within one’s power to change, does not cause it to become rejected.

-----Daf 35-----

- A Braisa says, **R’ Yehuda** said a cup should be filled from the blood on the floor, in case the entire blood of an animal had spilled on the floor. Taking from this mixture and throwing it to the Mizbe’ach will make that korban valid now as well. The **Rabanan** said to **R’ Yehuda**, that blood was possibly never caught in a keili, and is therefore not fit to be offered on the Mizbe’ach!? **R’ Yehuda** said, the Kohanim are careful and have surely caught each animal’s blood in a keili.
 - **Q:** Only the “life blood” is supposed to be thrown onto the Mizbe’ach, but the blood on the floor has a lot of blood other than the life blood mixed into it!? **A:** **R’ Yehuda** says that one is chayuv kares for eating blood other than life blood the same way he is chayuv for eating life blood. He obviously treats them the same and would therefore hold that the other blood may be offered on the Mizbe’ach as well.
 - **Q:** **R’ Elazar** said, that **R’ Yehuda** agrees that offering the other blood does not make a korban valid!? **A:** **R’ Yehuda** holds that blood does not become batul in other blood. Therefore, even though there may be only a small percentage of life blood on the floor mixed in with the other blood, it still retains its status as life blood and makes the Pesach valid when the mixture of blood is thrown onto the Mizbe’ach.
- The Braisa says, **R’ Yehuda** asked the **Rabanan**, if we don’t take blood from the floor, why would they prevent the blood from flowing out of the Azarah until after all the korbanos were brought!? The **Rabanan** answered, it was considered a beautiful thing to have the Kohanim walk in blood up to their knees (it showed their love for the Avodah).
 - **Q:** The blood acts as a chatzitza between the feet of the Kohanim and the floor of the Beis Hamikdash, which should not be permitted!? **A:** Since it is wet (as opposed to dry blood), it is not considered a chatzitza.
 - **Q:** The blood will make the clothing of the Kohanim dirty, and avodah done with dirty clothing is passul!? We can’t say that they lifted the clothing to prevent it from touching the blood, because a Braisa says that would also not be permitted!? **A:** They would walk in this blood when bringing the parts

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

of the animal to the Mizbe'ach, which is not an avodah, and were therefore allowed to lift their clothing when doing that.

- **Q:** Bringing the parts to the Mizbe'ach must be done by a Kohen, which means that it is an Avodah!? **A:** They would walk through the blood when carrying the wood for the Mizbe'ach, which is not an Avodah.
 - **Q:** How did they walk through it when carrying the blood or the parts of the animal!? **A:** They would walk on platforms built onto the floor, which were considered part of the floor, and were therefore not a chatzitza.

MISHNA

- If one shechts a korbon with intent to eat something that is not meant to be eaten or to burn something that is not meant to be burned, beyond its time or place, the korbon remains valid. **R' Eliezer** says it is passul.
 - If he shechted with intent to eat something that is meant to be eaten or burn something that is meant to be burned, beyond its time or place, but the intent was regarding a piece less than the size of a kezayis, the korbon remains valid.
 - If he intends to eat half of a kezayis beyond its time or place and to burn half of a kezayis beyond its time or place, it remains valid because eating and burning don't combine.
- If one shechts a korbon with the intent to eat a kezayis of the skin, or the gravy, or the sediment, or the hard vein in the neck which is inedible, or the bones, or the veins, or the horns, or the hooves, beyond its time or place, the korbon remains valid. Also, if he ate these parts of a korbon that was piggul, he would not be chayuv kares. He would also not be chayuv for nossar or for eating a korbon tamei on account of his eating of these pieces.
- If one shechts a kadosh animal with the intent to eat its fetus or its afterbirth beyond its allowable place, it will not make it piggul.
 - If one does "melika" on a bird korbon with the intent to eat its eggs beyond its allowable place, it will not make it piggul.
 - With regard to the milk inside a korbon and the eggs inside a bird korbon, one who eats them would not be chayuv for piggul (if the korbon was piggul), for nossar, or for a korbon tamei.

GEMARA

- **R' Elazar** said, if someone has piggul intent about a korbon, the fetus of the korbon also becomes piggul, but if he has piggul intent about the fetus, the korbon does not become piggul. If someone has piggul intent regarding the hard veins of a bird korbon, the crop becomes piggul, but the reverse is not true. If someone has piggul intent regarding the parts that are to be burned on the Mizbe'ach of the par helam davar or par Kohen Gadol, the entire bull becomes piggul, but the reverse is not true.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring proof to **R' Elazar** from a Braisa. The Braisa says that if one has a piggul intent regarding the eating of the meat or burning of the meat of the parim (which are supposed to be burned outside of Yerushalayim), the intent does not create piggul. Now, this suggests that he had this intent regarding the pieces that are supposed to be brought on the Mizbe'ach, even the rest of the meat would become piggul. We see this concept that piggul intent regarding one thing may not create piggul, but piggul intent regarding a different part may create piggul of all the parts! **A:** The inference of the Braisa may be that if he intended piggul regarding the pieces to be offered on the Mizbe'ach, *those* pieces become piggul, but maybe the others do not.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring proof from a Mishna. The Mishna says that after shechita of the "parim hanisrafim" (the parim which are burned outside the Azarah, discussed above) they become passul with "linah" (being left overnight). Presumably this refers to the meat being left overnight, and we can learn from this that if the meat becomes passul with "linah", then a piggul intent regarding the pieces that go on the Mizbe'ach would make the meat passul as well. We therefore see **R' Elazar's** view that piggul intent would make the meat passul even though intent about the meat would not make the korbon

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

piggul! **A:** It may be that the Mishna is referring to where the pieces that are offered on the Mizbe'ach were left overnight, not the meat.

- **Q:** The end of the Mishna clearly is discussing the meat, which would suggest that the earlier part is as well!? **A:** That is not necessarily true. It may very well be that the first part discusses the pieces to be offered on the Mizbe'ach and the later part discusses the meat.
- **Q: Rabbah** asked from a Braisa. The Braisa gives a list of things that neither effect piggul (if a piggul intent is had about them) nor become piggul (if the korbon becomes piggul). Included in the list is the animal's fetus and a bird's crop. This refutes **R' Elazar** who said these items do become piggul along with the animal!? **A:** The Mishna means that a piggul intent about them will not make the korbon piggul, and that a piggul intent about them will not even make these pieces piggul. However, the Mishna would agree that a piggul intent about the korbon itself would even make these items piggul.
- **Rava** brings a proof for **R' Elazar** from our Mishna. The Mishna said, if one shechts a kadosh animal with the intent to eat its fetus or its afterbirth beyond its allowable place, it will not make it piggul. If one does "melika" on a bird korbon with the intent to eat its eggs beyond its allowable place, it will not make it piggul. The Mishna then said, with regard to the milk inside a korbon and the eggs inside a bird korbon, one who eats them would not be chayuv for piggul (if the korbon was piggul), for nossar, or for a korbon tamei. This suggests that for eating the fetus or afterbirth one would be chayuv for piggul, which contradicts the earlier part of the Mishna!? Rather, we must say that this last part is talking about where piggul intent was had on the korbon, and teaches that the issur of piggul extends to the fetus, etc. as well, and the earlier part is talking about one who had a piggul intent about these parts themselves, in which case there is no piggul at all. This is exactly the view of **R' Elazar – SHEMAH MINAH.**
- A Mishna says, that if the pieces of an animal that was a baal mum were brought onto the Mizbe'ach, they must be taken down. **R' Akiva** says they may remain on the Mizbe'ach. **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, **R' Akiva** only allowed this for the type of mum like cataracts in the eye. Since such a mum does not make a bird passul it also does not require that the animal be removed from the Mizbe'ach on account of it. Also, this is only if the mum came about after the animal was made kadosh. **R' Akiva** would also agree regarding a female olah, that it is considered to be as if the mum came before it was made kadosh (an olah may only be brought from the male gender).
 - **Q: R' Zeira** asked, the Braisa quoted above says that if one offers a fetus (or anything else on the list) as a korbon outside the Azarah he is patur. This suggests that he would be chayuv for offering meat of the mother. Now this can only be in regard to a female olah, because that is the only female animal whose meat would be offered on the Mizbe'ach. Now, if **R' Akiva** says that the meat of a female olah remains on the Mizbe'ach if it was brought up there, we can say that this Braisa follows his view. However, if he holds that it would have to be taken down, who does the Braisa follow!? **A:** The inference from the Mishna should be that if one offers the "eimurim" of the mother outside he is chayuv, not the meat of the mother.
 - **Q:** The Braisa seems to refer to any part of the fetus, which would then make the inference refer to any part of the mother!? **A:** Change the Braisa to say that if he offers the eimurim of the fetus outside he is patur, which would suggest that if he offers the eimurim of the mother outside, he would be chayuv.

-----Daf 17---36-----

MISHNA

- If one shechted a korbon with the intent to leave its blood or its eimurim until the next day, or with the intent to take them outside the Azarah, **R' Yehuda** says the korbon is passul and the **Chachomim** say it is valid.
- If one shechts a korbon with intent to apply the blood to the ramp of the Mizbe'ach, or not opposite the base of the Mizbe'ach, or to apply below the line when it should be applied above it, or visa-versa, or to apply on the outside Mizbe'ach that which should be applied on the inside Mizbe'ach, or visa-versa, or with the intent that

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

tamei people should eat it, or that tamei people should offer it on the Mizbe'ach, or that people without a bris should eat it or offer it, or with the intent to break the bones of a Korbon Pesach or to eat from it when it is half raw, or with intent to mix the blood with the blood of passul korbanos, the korbon remains valid. This is because the only intent that makes a korbon passul is intent to consume beyond its time or place, and the intent to shecht a Pesach or a chatas not for its sake.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is the reason for the view of **R' Yehuda**? **A:** **R' Elazar** said there are two pesukim that teach the halacha of nossar – “lo sosiru mimenu ahd boker” and “lo yani'ach mimenu ahd boker”. The second pasuk is not needed to teach regarding leaving it past its time, so it must be teaching for a case of intent to leave past its time.
 - **Q:** This extra pasuk is needed for the drasha of a Braisa that teaches the various korbanos which are limited to eating for the day it is offered and the following night!? **A:** The pasuk could have said “lo sosiru” but instead says “lo yani'ach”. It is this use of verbiage that teaches regarding intent to leave past its time.
 - **Q:** This only gives the basis for **R' Yehuda** regarding the psul of intent to leave it over. What about the basis for the psul of the intent to take it out of the Azarah? Further, we see in a Braisa that **R' Yehuda's** view is based on logic, not a pasuk!? The Braisa says that the logic is that if actually leaving it over to the next day makes the korbon passul, then intending to leave it over should also make it passul! **A:** Rather, his view is based on logic.
 - **Q:** If so, why doesn't he use this logic to argue in all the cases listed in the Mishna? **A:** There is a reason why he doesn't argue by each case.
 - He doesn't argue regarding breaking the bones of a Pesach or eating from it not fully cooked because even if someone does these things the korbon won't become passul.
 - The same is true when a tamei or person without a bris eats from or offers the korbon (the korbon does not become passul).
 - **Another** reason is that the person with the intent does not have the power to make the tamei person or person without the bris eat or offer the korbon. That is why his intent to do so can't make the korbon passul.
 - He doesn't argue regarding the mixing of the blood, because he is of the opinion that blood is not mevatel other blood.
 - He doesn't argue regarding putting the blood in the wrong place because he holds that putting it on the wrong place on the Mizbe'ach is given the status of putting it in the right place.
 - He doesn't argue regarding putting it on the wrong Mizbe'ach because he holds it only becomes passul when it is put in a place where it is sometimes appropriate to put blood, meat and eimurim. Inside the Heichal is never appropriate for meat and eimurim, and therefore intending to put the blood there will not make the korbon passul.
 - Although we find elsewhere **R' Yehuda** seems not to hold this way, we find other places where he does, and therefore must say there are different views as to what the view of **R' Yehuda** was in this matter.
- **R' Abba** said, **R' Yehuda** would agree that if one had an intent to leave it over and then had an intent for piggul, the korbon would become piggul.
 - **Rava** said this can be proven from the fact that a piggul intent is not effective until the Kohen follows through with the zrika. Essentially, until it actually becomes piggul, it was intended to be left over until after its time and then becomes piggul. This is really the same thing that **R' Abba** is saying.
 - The Gemara says this is not a true proof. The cases are different, because a regular piggul intent is made of one intention, whereas **R' Abba** is talking about having 2 separate intentions.
 - **Q:** **R' Huna** asked **R' Abba**, a Braisa says, if the Kohen intended to do the zrika below when it should have really been done above the red line, or visa-versa, then if he intended to do so on the same day (when the zrika should have been done) it is valid. Therefore, if he then intends to consume the korbon

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

outside its place, it is passul and there is no kares. However, if he had then intended to consume it beyond its proper time, it would make the korbon into piggul and there would be kares. On the other hand, if he had initially intended to do the zrika in the wrong place on the *next* day, it is passul. Therefore, if he then intended to consume it outside its place or beyond its proper time, it would be passul and there would be no kares. This refutes **R' Abba! TEYUFTA.**

- **R' Chisda in the name of Ravina bar Sila** said, if a Kohen had an intent that tamei people should eat the korbon beyond its time, it becomes piggul and there is a chiyuv kares.
 - **Rava** said this can be proven from the fact that the meat of the korbon is not fit to be eaten before the zrika and yet when the Kohen has a piggul intent it becomes piggul.
 - The Gemara says this is not a true proof. In **Rava's** case the zrika will be done and the meat will become mutar, whereas in **R' Chisda's** case the meat will never be fit to eat by the tamei person.
- **R' Chisda** said, **R' Dimi bar Chinina** used to say, with regard to the meat of a Pesach that was not broiled, and Todah breads from which the Kohen's portion was not separated, one would be chayuv kares for eating them while he is tamei.
 - **Rava** said this can be proven from a Braisa which says that the words "asher LaHashem" in the pasuk teach that a tamei person would get kares for eating the eimurim of kodshei kalim. We see that although they are not fit to be eaten, a tamei person would be chayuv kares for eating them. Here too, even though these things are not fit to be eaten, a tamei person would get kares for eating them.
 - The Gemara says this is not a proof. The eimurim of kodshei kalim are fit to be consumed on the Mizbe'ach, whereas the Pesach that was not broiled, and Todah breads from which the Kohen's portion was not separated are not fit for consumption by people or by the Mizbe'ach.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL HAPSULIN!!!

-----Daf תל"ז---37-----

PEREK BEIS SHAMAI OMRIM -- PEREK REVI'I

MISHNA

- **B"S** say, with regard to all korbanos whose blood is applied to the outside Mizbe'ach, if the Kohen made only one application of blood the kapparah is effective (even if there should have been two applications). With regard to a chatas (where 4 applications are required), the kapparah is effective even if he only did 2 applications. **B"H** say, even a chatas which the Kohen did only one application brings the kapparah.
 - Based on the above, if the Kohen did the first application properly and had a beyond its time intent during the second application, the korbon remains valid and brings its kapparah. Also, if he had an intent for beyond its time during the first application and an intent for beyond its place during the second application, the korbon is considered to be piggul and would carry the kares penalty.
- With regard to korbanos whose blood is applied to the inside Mizbe'ach, if the Kohen left out even one of the required applications, the korbon does not bring its kapparah. Therefore, if he did all the applications properly except for one during which he had an intent of beyond its time or place, the korbon would be passul but there would be no kares.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, how do we know that for blood that is applied to the outside Mizbe'ach even one application brings the kapparah? The pasuk says "v'dam zevachecha yishafeich", which suggests that even one pouring brings kapparah.
 - **Q:** This pasuk is used by a different Braisa to teach that all the blood left over in the kli shareis must be poured onto the base of the Mizbe'ach, so it is not available to teach the ruling of our Mishna!? **A:** The

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

first Braisa will learn this halacha regarding the left over blood as does **Rebbi** in a Braisa, from the extra word of “badam” in a pasuk.

- **Q:** This pasuk is used by **R' Yishmael** in a different Braisa to teach that if blood that was supposed to be applied by throwing it (zrika) but was instead applied by pouring it (shficha), the Kohen is yotzeh, so it is not available to teach the ruling of our Mishna!? **A:** The first Braisa will hold like **R' Akiva** who does not agree with that ruling.
- **Q:** This pasuk is used by **R' Yishmael** in a different Braisa to teach that even a Korbon Pesach and Korbon Maaser must have their blood applied to the Mizbeach, so it is not available to teach the ruling of our Mishna!? **A:** The first Braisa will learn this halacha regarding the Pesach and Maaser like **R' Yose Haglili** in a Braisa, who learns this halacha from the fact that the pasuk regarding Bechor says “damam” and “chelbam” (in the plural rather than the singular).
- **Q:** How could **R' Yishmael** use the pasuk of “v'dam zevachecha yishafeich” to teach the halacha of throwing being included in pouring and the halacha of Pesach and Maaser? **A:** There are two Tanna'im who argue as to what **R' Yishmael** learned from that pasuk.
- **Q:** The pasuk regarding the Bechor says in the plural form “ubisaram yihiyeh lach” – that the “meats” should belong to the Kohen. Now, according to **R' Yishmael** who says that the pasuk is only speaking of Bechor, but about the 3 different types of animals, this makes sense. However, according to **R' Yose** who says that the pasuk also refers to Pesach and Maaser, why would their meat go to the Kohen? The meat of a Pesach and Maaser belong to the owners!? **A:** The plural verbiage is referring to two types of bechor – a bechor without a mum and a bechor with a mum. The pasuk teaches that the meat of both of these belongs to the Kohen.
 - **R' Yishmael** would learn that the meat of a baal mum belongs to the Kohen from the words “lecha yihiyeh” written at the end of the pasuk.
- **Q:** According to **R' Yose Haglili** who says that the pasuk of bechor also speaks of Pesach and maaser, we can interpret the words “kodesh heim” as teaching that the temurah of none of these 3 korbanos will be offered on the Mizbe'ach, which we find in other Mishnayos is the correct ruling. However, according to **R' Yishmael**, who says that the pasuk only speaks of bechor, how does he know that the temurah of a Pesach and maaser are not offered? **A:** Maaser is learned from a gezeira shava of “avarah” from bechor, and Pesach is learned from the word “hu” written regarding a Pesach, which teaches that only it is offered, and not its temurah.
- **Q:** According to all the Tanna'in in the quoted Braisos that use the pasuk of “v'dam zevachecha yishafeich” for other drashos, how do they learn the halacha that for blood that is applied to the outside Mizbe'ach even one application brings the kapparah? **A:** They hold like **B"H**, who hold that even a chatas which gets only one application will be valid, and they learn all other korbanos from chatas.

V'HACHATAS SHTEI MATANOS

- **R' Huna** said, the view of **B"S** is based on the fact that the word “karnos” (read in the plural form) is written 3 times, which brings to a total of 6 corners. Four of them are needed to teach that placing blood on the 4 corners is the preferred mitzvah, and the remaining two are to teach that a minimum of two is absolutely essential. **B"H** say that only one of the three are written in the plural (karnos, with a vuv) and the other two are written in the singular (karnas, without a vuv). That brings to a total of 4 corners. Three of them are needed to teach that placing blood on 3 corners is the preferred mitzvah, and the remaining one teaches that application to one corner is absolutely essential.
 - **Q:** Why don't **B"H** say that all 4 are needed to teach the preferred method of the mitzvah, and that no zrika is absolutely essential? **A:** It can't be that a kapparah would take place without any application to the Mizbe'ach.
 - **Another** way to understand the basis of **B"H** is that since the words as read tell of 6 corners and the words as written tell us of 4 corners, the Torah must be telling us to use the number in between. Therefore, we have a total of 5 corners – 4 to teach the preferred method of doing the mitzvah, and one to teach that one is absolutely essential.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa regarding tefillin says, the pesukim say “l’totafos” three times – once written in the plural and twice written in the singular, but all read in the plural – which teaches us that the tefillin must have 4 compartments (based on the written form). Now, according to the answer that we just gave, we should say that the Torah means for us to use the number in between that suggested by the written form and that suggested by the read form, and therefore the tefillin should need 5 compartments!? **A:** **B”H** hold like **R’ Akiva**, who learns the four compartments of tefillin from the word “totafos” – with the word “tot” meaning “two” in the Kaspi language, and the word “fos” meaning “two” in the African language.
- **Q:** The pesukim regarding sukkah say “basukkos” three times – once written in the plural and twice written in the singular, but all read in the plural – which teaches us that a sukkah needs 4 walls. Now, according to the answer that we just gave, we should say that the Torah means for us to use the number in between that suggested by the written form and that suggested by the read form, and therefore **B”H** should hold that a sukkah needs five walls!? **A:** Regarding sukkah, one mention is needed to teach the halacha of sukkah itself and one is needed to teach the halacha of the sukkah covering (the “schach”). That leaves only 3 mentions of sukkah left. A Halacha L’Moshe MiSinai teaches that one wall may be as small as a tefach. That leaves a total of 2 walls plus one tefach of a third wall as being necessary to make a valid sukkah.
- **Q:** The pasuk regarding a woman who gave birth to a girl says that she is tamei for “shevu’ayim” (two weeks), but it is written as “shivi’im” (70 days). Now, according to the answer that we just gave, we should say that the Torah means for us to use the number in between that suggested by the written form and that suggested by the read form, and therefore **B”H** should hold that she is tamei for 42 days!? **A:** The pasuk says she is tamei “kinidasah” – like her niddah tumah, which teaches that the word should be interpreted as referring to weeks, not days. Therefore, we understand it to mean that she is tamei for 2 weeks.

-----Daf פל-----38-----

- A Braisa says that the basis for the view of **B”H** is as follows. The word “v’chiper” is written 3 times in the pesukim regarding a chatas offered on the outside Mizbe’ach, which teaches that only one application is essential, because we would have thought to say that all 4 are essential. Now, why would we think to say all 4 are essential? We would learn that only one blood applications is essential based on logic – the Torah discusses blood applications below the “chut hasikra” and applications above it. Just as regarding the ones below it only one is essential, the same should be true for the ones above it! However, we may also think to learn the other way – the Torah discusses blood applications on the inside Mizbe’ach and applications on the outside Mizbe’ach. Just as regarding the ones on the inside Mizbe’ach all 4 are essential, the same should be true for the ones on the outside Mizbe’ach! On the one hand we should learn the chatas from the other korbanos, because they are all brought on the outside Mizbe’ach. On the other hand we should learn from the inside Mizbe’ach, because that would be learning the halacha for a chatas from another case of chatas. Therefore, because we can darshen each way, the Torah writes the word “v’chiper” 3 times to teach – there is a kapparah even if there were only 3 applications, there is a kapparah even if there were only 2 applications, and there is a kapparah even if there was only 1 application.
 - **Q:** These words are needed to teach that the various chatas korbanos bring a kapparah, so they are not available to teach that only one blood application is essential!? **A:** **Rava** said that **Bar Ada** explained to him, each pasuk says “v’nislach”, which teaches that the korban brings a kapparah. Therefore the “v’chiper” is available to teach regarding the one essential blood application.
 - **Q:** Maybe the 3 mentions of “v’chiper” teach – there is a kapparah even if there were only 3 applications above the chut hasikra (the line) and one below, there is a kapparah even if there were only 2 applications above the line and 2 below, and there is a kapparah even if there was only 1 application above the line and 3 below, and by extension we would say that there is kapparah even if all 4 were applied below the line, but all 4 are still needed!? **A:** **R’ Ada bar Yitzchak** said, if this were true, the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

entire halacha that the blood be placed on the “kranos” (on the upper half of the Mizbe’ach) would become batul! Therefore, that can’t be the drasha.

- **Q:** Why is that a concern? If the Torah says to make it batul, so be it!? **A: Rava** said, the 3 mentions of the word must be teaching regarding something that only needs 3 drashos. To teach that all four applications can go below the line, we would need four mentions of the word. Therefore, the words must be teaching regarding the essential application, by having 3 words that remove the need for 3 out of the 4 applications.
- **Q:** Maybe say that the words teach that there is an effective kapparah even if there is only one application above the line? **A:** We never find an instance where part of the blood is applied above and part is applied below.
 - **Q:** A Mishna teaches that the Kohen Gadol would sprinkle the blood once upward and 7 times downward towards the kapores on Yom Kippur!? **A:** That refers to the position of the Kohen Gadol’s hand, but not to where the blood actually had to land.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that the Kohen Gadol would sprinkle 7 times onto the middle of the inside Mizbe’ach. Now presumably some of the blood reached that spot and others didn’t, which means that some went above and some went below!? **A: Rava bar Shila** said, the Mishna means that he sprinkled 7 times onto the exposed top platform of the Mizbe’ach, not the midpoint of the height.
 - **Q:** Although the blood applications of a chatas are done above the line, the excess blood is then poured at the base, which is below the line!? **A:** When we said that we don’t find an instance where part of the blood is applied above and part is applied below, we were not referring to the excess blood leftover from the applications, because the pouring of the leftover blood is not essential.
 - **Q:** The pouring of the blood after application to the inside Mizbe’ach is seen by some as being essential!? **A:** We were referring to where blood is applied above and below on the same Mizbe’ach.
- A Braisa says, **R’ Eliezer ben Yaakov** said, **B”S** say the two essential applications of a chatas and the one of other korbanos permit the meat to be eaten and, if done with piggul intent cause the korban to become piggul. **B”H** say the one essential application of a chatas and the one of other korbanos permit the meat to be eaten and, if done with piggul intent cause the korban to become piggul.
 - **Q: R’ Oshaya** asked, if this is true, **B”S** is more lenient than **B”H**, and this should be included in the list of areas where **B”S** is more lenient!? **A: Rava** said, the machlokes is really based on how many applications are essential, and regarding that **B”H** is more lenient. Therefore, it is not a case of **B”S** being more lenient.
- **R’ Yochanan** said, the 3 non-essential blood applications of a chatas may not be done at night, but they may be done after the death of the owner, and a person who does them outside the Mikdash would be chayuv.
 - **R’ Pappa** said, in certain ways these 3 are like the first, essential application, and in some ways they are like the non-essential pouring of the leftover blood. With regard to doing it outside the Mikdash, to doing them at night, to doing them with a non-Kohen, to using a kli shareis, to applying them to the corner of the Mizbe’ach with the Kohen’s finger, to the requirement to wash the clothing onto which they splattered, and the halacha of creating “leftover blood”, they are like the essential application. With regard to doing them after the death of the owner, that they do not permit the meat to be eaten, that they do not create piggul, and that they do not make the korban passul if they are brought inside the Heichal, they are treated like the leftover blood. **R’ Pappa** said, I learn that the clothing onto which the blood splattered must be washed, from a Mishna. The Mishna says, if blood splattered from the neck of the animal onto the clothing or from the Mizbe’ach onto the clothing, it need not be washed. This implies that if it splattered from a place from which it is fit to be put onto the Mizbe’ach, it would have to be washed.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The Mishna says that if it splattered from the base of the Mizbe'ach the clothing would not have to be washed. Based on the way **R' Pappa** learned, we should imply that if it splattered from blood that is fit to be poured on the base, it would require washing. However, the pasuk says that the clothing must be washed when "asher yizeh" – when the blood sprinkles on the clothing, which excludes the case of blood that has already been sprinkled onto the Mizbe'ach, so you can't say that blood that is fit to be poured onto the base must be washed off!? **R' Pappa** will have to say that the Mishna follows the view of **R' Nechemya**, who holds that leftover blood is treated like regular blood for the issur of offering it outside of the Mikdash, and would likewise treat it like regular blood that requires washing. The **Rabanan** who argue with **R' Nechemya** and say that he would not be chayuv for offering such blood outside may also argue with him and hold that it would not require washing. Therefore, **R' Pappa** has no proof to his view.

-----Daf 39-----

- The Gemara has just suggested that **R' Nechemya**, who holds that leftover blood is treated like regular blood for the issur of offering it outside of the Mikdash, would likewise treat it like regular blood and require clothing that was splattered with such blood to be washed.
 - **Q:** Maybe **R' Nechemya** only treats leftover blood like regular blood in regard to the issur of offering it outside the Mikdash, since it is similar to the limbs and fats of a korban, for which there is also an issur to offer them outside the Mikdash, but maybe he does not treat it as such for purposes of requiring a washing!? **A:** We find that **R' Nechemya** does treat it as such with regard to washing as well, in a Braisa. The Braisa says, blood that must be poured onto the base of the Mizbe'ach (presumably leftover blood), must be washed off of clothing, a piggul intent involving them makes the korban piggul, and a person who offers them outside the Mikdash is chayuv. Blood that is to be poured into the canal (this was done for passul blood) does not require washing, a piggul intent involving them does not make the korban piggul, and a person who offers them outside the Mikdash is not chayuv. Now, who is the view that the one who offers the leftover blood outside the Mikdash is chayuv? That is the view of **R' Nechemya**, and we see that he also requires it to be washed off of clothing.
 - **Q:** How could this Braisa be referring to leftover blood and say that it can be the subject of an effective piggul intent? A Braisa says that a piggul intent is ineffective regarding the leftover blood!? Rather, it must be that the Braisa refers to the last three blood applications of a chatas, and therefore the Braisa does not prove that **R' Nechemya** holds that leftover blood must be washed off of clothing!
 - **Q:** If the Braisa is referring to the last 3 blood applications, why does it refer to them as "blood that must be poured onto the base"? That blood is supposed to be poured onto the Mizbe'ach itself!? **A:** The Braisa means that after these applications the leftover will be poured onto the base, and that is why it referred to it as such.
 - **Q:** How can you say that these last 3 applications can be the subject of a piggul intent? We have learned previously that this blood can't be the subject of an effective piggul intent!? **A:** Rather, it refers to the leftover blood of an "inner chatas" (a chatas offered on the inside Mizbe'ach).
 - **Q:** That would imply that the leftover blood from an offering on the outside Mizbe'ach would not need to be washed off of clothing, would not make an effective piggul, and one who offers them outside the Mikdash would not be chayuv. If so, then when the Braisa discusses blood that must be poured into the canal because it wants to contrast with a case of where the washing, piggul, and offering outside halachos don't apply, why not instead contrast with the example of leftover blood from an offering on the outside Mizbe'ach? **A:** The Braisa follows the view of **R' Nechemya**, who holds that one who offers such

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

blood outside the Mikdash would be chayuv. Therefore, the contrast could not be made on all three halachos if this example would have been used.

- The earlier Gemara brought a Mishna as proof to **R' Pappa** that when the blood of the non-essential applications splatters onto clothing, we would be required to wash the clothing. The Gemara then asked and refuted the proof. **Ravina** now explains the Mishna so that it is not refuted by that question. He says, when the Mishna says if blood splattered from the neck of the animal onto the clothing or from the Mizbe'ach onto the clothing it need not be washed, it is referring to blood that was already applied to the Mizbe'ach. When the Mishna then says that if it splattered from the base of the Mizbe'ach the clothing would not have to be washed, it is referring to blood that is fit to be poured onto the base, but not blood that was already applied to the base.

KOL HANITANIN AHL MIZBE'ACH HAPNIMI...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding one of the inside chatas says, “v'asa lapar kasher asah”. This double verbiage comes to teach that if any of the applications are not done, the kapparah is not effective. Now, we would think this is only true for the 7 applications done towards the paroches, since whenever 7 such applications are done they are essential. How do we know that even the 4 applications on the Mizbe'ach are essential? We learn this from the words “kein yaaseh”. The word “lapar” refers to the par brought on Yom Kippur and teaches that it is included in these halachos. The words “kasher asah l'par”, refer to the Par Kohen Mosh'ach. “Hachatas” refers to the goat chatas brought for the sin of avoda zara. We would think to also include the goat chatas of Yom Tov and Rosh Chodesh. The pasuk therefore says “lo”, which teaches to exclude them from this group. The reason we choose to include the others and exclude these is that the others are brought as a kapparah for a known sin, whereas the chatas of Yom Tov and Rosh Chodesh are not brought for a known sin. The word “v'chiper” teaches that there is an effective kapparah even if semicha is not done, and “v'nislach” teaches that there is an effective kapparah even if the leftover blood is not spilled onto the base of the Mizbe'ach. The reason we see fit to say the blood applications are essential whereas the semicha and pouring onto the base are not, is because we find that blood applications are essential in all other cases whereas semicha and pouring onto the base are not.

-----Daf 40-----

- The Gemara has just quoted a Braisa that darshened the pasuk regarding the par helam davar. The Gemara now analyzes a number of parts of the Braisa.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said that we find elsewhere that when 7 applications are required, they are essential. Where do we find this? **A: R' Pappa** said, we find this by the parah adumah and regarding the taharah process of a metzora.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said that “kein yaaseh” teaches that the 4 applications on the Mizbe'ach are essential for these korbanos as well. Now, the Braisa learns that the 7 applications are essential based on the fact that the Torah uses a double verbiage. The Torah uses a double verbiage regarding the 4 applications, so why do we need other words to teach that they are essential!? **A: R' Yirmiya** said, the “kein yaaseh” is only needed according to the view of **R' Shimon** who argues with **R' Yehuda** in a Braisa and says that the other words in the pasuk do not refer to applications on all 4 corners.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yehuda**, who darshens this from the words “b'ohel mo'ed”, what is “kein yaaseh” needed for? **A:** He uses it as a Braisa does, to teach that the par of Yom Kippur required semicha and to have the leftover blood poured onto the base.
 - **Q:** The earlier Braisa taught that the word “lapar” teaches to compare the par of Yom Kippur to the par helam davar. That should serve as a basis for requiring it to have semicha and to have the leftover poured on the base!? **A:** Without the “kein yaaseh” we would think the comparison only teaches that the par of Yom Kippur shares the halachos that are essential for the kapparah, which would not include semicha and the pouring of the leftover blood.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** What does **R' Shimon** darshen with the words “b’ohel mo’ed”? **A:** He darshens it to teach that if any part of the roof of the Ohel Mo’ed is missing the Kohen could not sprinkle the blood.
 - **R' Yehuda** would learn this from the word “asher”. **R' Shimon** would not darshen the word “asher”.
- **Abaye** said, the “kein yaaseh” is even needed according to **R' Yehuda**. We would have thought that although the 4 applications are written and repeated it does not mean that they are essential, as can be seen from semicha and the pouring of the leftover blood, which are also written and repeated and are still not essential. That is why “kein yaaseh” was needed to teach that the 4 applications are essential.
- **Q:** The Braisa said that “lapar” refers to the par chatas of Yom Kippur. For what halacha would it need to be referred to in this pasuk? It can’t be to teach that all the blood applications are essential, because we already know that from the fact that the pasuk regarding it says “chukah”!? **A:** **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, it is needed according to **R' Yehuda**, who says that “chukah” only applies to things done by the Kohen Gadol when he wears the white clothing for Avodos inside the Kodesh Hakodashim, and teaches that they must be done in their proper order, but anything done by the Kohen Gadol when wearing his white clothing outside of the Kodesh Hakodashim is not essential to be done in the order as written. We would think to say that since the order is not essential the blood applications are also not essential. That is why we need “lapar” to teach that they are essential.
 - **Q:** **R' Pappa** asked, there is a Braisa where **R' Yehuda** learns from a different pasuk that the Avodos are essential, so why is “lapar” needed to compare it to the par helam davar? **A:** **R' Pappa** said, the comparison is needed for the halachos that a blister on the Kohen’s finger will not be a chatzitza, that there must initially be enough blood in the keili for the Kohen to dip his finger into, and that the Kohen must dip his finger into the blood, and not wipe the blood onto his finger.
 - A Braisa says like **R' Pappa** as well. The Braisa says, **Rebbi** says the word “lapar” comes to teach that the par of Yom Kippur is like the par helam davar in every way (as **R' Pappa** said). **R' Yishmael** said, this could be learned from a kal v’chomer – if in a place where the Torah doesn’t require that the same species of korban be brought it still requires that the procedures be the same, then in a place where the species must be the same (both are a par) the procedures must certainly be the same! Therefore, the “lapar” is not needed for that. Rather, “lapar” refers to the par helam davar and “lapar” written the second time refers to the par Kohen Hamoshi’ach.
 - **Q:** What does **R' Yishmael** mean when he says “if in a place where the Torah doesn’t require that the same species...”? It can’t be referring to the bull of Yom Kippur and the goat of Yom Kippur, because it makes sense to compare those, since the blood of both of them is brought into the Kodesh Hakodashim!? It also can’t be referring to the par helam davar and the chatas goat brought for the sin of avoda zara, because it makes sense to compare those, since they are both brought for known aveiros!? **A:** Rather, he was referring to the par helam davar and the Yom Kippur goat – they are of different species and yet they are compared for their procedures. If so, certainly the par of the Kohen Gadol and the par of Yom Kippur, which are of the same species, are to be compared for their procedures. Based on this kal v’chomer **R' Yishmael** learns the halachos for the par of Yom Kippur from the Par Kohen Mosh’ach, and the Yom Kippur chatas goat from the chatas goat brought for the sin of avoda zara.
 - **Q:** How could we take something that was learned via a hekesh and then use that to darshen a kal v’chomer? **A:** **R' Pappa** said, that the yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** taught that this may be done.