



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Zevachim, Daf מ"ח – Daf נ"ח

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 מ"ח-----48-----

PAR V'SA'IR SHEL YOM HAKIPPURIM...

- **Q:** The requirement of shechita to be done in the north is written regarding an olah. If so, why is it that the Mishna begins teaching the requirement by listing the chataos? **A:** Since chatas is learned via a drasha it is considered more beloved to the Tanna, and that is why he discusses it first.
 - **Q:** Why doesn't the Tanna first discuss the case of the outside chataos, since that is where the drasha is learned!? **A:** Since the blood of the Yom Kippur korbanos have their blood brought into the Kodosh Hakodashim, they are more beloved to the Tanna, and that is why he begins with discussing them.
- **Q:** Where is it written that the olah must be shechted in the north? **A:** The pasuk says "v'shachat oso ahl yerech haMizbe'ach tzafonah".
 - **Q:** The preceding pasuk says this is referring to an olah brought from sheep or goats. How do we know that this applies to an olah brought from cattle as well? **A:** The pasuk begins with the word "v'ihm", with the conjunctive "vuv" creating a hekesh to the earlier parsha which discusses a cattle olah. This teaches that an olah brought from cattle must also be shechted in the north.
 - **Q:** What about according to the view from a Braisa that a previous parsha cannot learn from a later parsha? The Braisa says that **R' Akiva** says that the "v'ihm nefesh" in the parsha of asham taluy connects it to the previous parsha of asham me'ilah and teaches that an asham taluy is also brought for a case of safek me'ilah. The **Chachomim** argue and say a person is patur for safek me'ilah. Presumably, the machlokes is that **R' Akiva** says we learn a previous parsha from a later parsha and the **Rabanan** say that we don't!? **A:** **R' Pappa** said, that all agree that we do learn an earlier parsha from a later one. The reason the **Rabanan** hold that an asham taluy is not brought for a safek me'ilah is because there is a gezeira shava on the word "mitzvos" between asham taluy and a regular chatas, which teaches that an asham taluy is only brought for an aveira which requires a chatas when done b'shogeg and has a chiyuv kares when done b'meized. This excludes me'ilah, which does not carry a chiyuv kares. **R' Akiva** darshens the gezeira shava to teach that an asham taluy is only brought for an aveira which requires the bringing of a fixed chatas. The **Rabanan** disagree with that, because they say that a gezeira shava must be taken all the way, and cannot stop less than learning the full comparison. Although **R' Akiva** also agrees to that, he says that the "vuv" creates a hekesh which teaches that there is an asham taluy for safek me'ilah, even though the gezeira shava would seem to teach differently.
 - **Q:** Maybe the machlokes is that when we are faced with a conflicting gezeira shava and hekesh, **R' Akiva** says we follow the hekesh and the **Rabanan** say we follow the gezeira shava? **A:** All agree that we follow the hekesh. However, they say that this hekesh is not to teach the upper parsha from the lower parsha, rather it is to teach the lower parsha from the upper parsha – that the asham taluy must have a value of at least 2 silver shekels, just like the asham of me'ilah. This is needed so that we not think that an asham taluy can be worth even a smaller amount, since the chatas for that same aveira could be worth any amount. **R' Akiva** (who uses the hekesh for his drasha) will learn this halacha from the pasuk of "v'zos Toras ha'asham", which teaches that there is one set of rules for all ashamos.
 - **Q:** This makes sense only according to the view that "Toras" is to be understood in this way, but according to the other view, from where would **R' Akiva** know that an asham taluy must be worth at least 2 silver shekels? **A:** He learns it from

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

a gezeira shava of “b’erkicha”. For the asham shifcha charufa, where this word is not written, he will learn it from a gezeira shava on the word “b’eil”.

- **Q:** How do we know that a chatas must be shechted in the north? **A:** The pasuk says “v’shachat es hachatas bimkom ha’olah”.
 - **Q:** How do we know that the kabbalah must also be done in the north? **A:** The immediately following pasuk begins with “v’lakach (which we learn refers to the kabbalah) haKohen midamah”, which can be read as saying that this too must be done in the place of the olah.
 - **Q:** How do we know that the Kohen doing the kabbalah must be in the north as well? **A:** The word “v’lakach” can be read as saying “lo yikach” – he should take himself (and stand in the north).
 - **Q:** How do we know that the requirement to shecht it in the north is essential, and it is passul if it is shechted elsewhere? **A:** There are other pesukim regarding the various types of chatas, and the multiple pesukim teach that it is absolutely essential.
 - **Q:** The word “oso” in the pasuk of “v’shachat oso bimkom asher yishchat es ha’olah” is an exclusionary term, so what does it come to exclude? **A:** It is needed as darshened in a Braisa, which says that the pasuk teaches that only it – the Nasi’s chatas discussed in the pasuk – needs to be shechted in the north, but the chatas of Nachshon (the chatas brought by the Nesi’im at the time that the Mishkan was inaugurated) need not be shechted in the north. We would have thought that since **R’ Yehuda** says this chatas needed semicha, it needed the north as well. That is why “oso” is needed to teach that it did not have to be shechted in the north.
 - **Q:** What about according to **R’ Shimon** who says it did not need semicha? **Mar Zutra the son of R’ Tavi** said to **Ravina**, even according to **R’ Yehuda** you can’t say that we would have thought that since it was included for semicha it should be included for the north, because we would not learn this one time korbon from other korbanos that are brought for generations. Therefore, “oso” is not needed to exclude the north requirement of the chatas of Nachshon!? **A:** Rather, “oso” teaches that the animal must be in the north when it is shechted, but the shochet need not be standing in the north.
 - **Q:** This halacha is learned in a Braisa from the “oso” of a different pasuk, so the “oso” written regarding the Nasi’s chatas is not needed for this!? **A:** Rather, it teaches that the shechita of the animal needs to take place in the north, but the melika done to a bird korbon need not be done in the north. A Braisa says, we would think that if shechita, which can be done without a Kohen, needs to be done in the north, then melika, which must be done by a Kohen, must certainly be done in the north. That is why we need “oso” to teach that melika does not need to be done in the north.
 - **Q:** Maybe the reason shechita of an animal must be done in the north is that the shechita must be done with a kli, but Melika, which is done with the Kohen’s hand would never even be thought to need the north, so why do we need “oso”? **A:** Rather, “oso” teaches that the Nasi’s chatas must be in the north, but the Korbon Pesach need not be shechted in the north. A Braisa says, we would think that if shechita of an olah, which has no set time, must be done in the north, then shechita of a Pesach, which has a set time, must surely be done in the north. That is why we need “oso” to teach that it need not be done in the north.
 - **Q:** Maybe the reason an olah must be shechted in the north is because it is totally burned on the Mizbe’ach, but there would be no reason to think that a Pesach should need to be shechted in the north!? **A:** We could make this same kal v’chomer from a chatas, which is not totally burned.
 - **Q:** Maybe a chatas needs the north because it brings a kapparah for aveiros that carry a chiyuv kares? **A:** We could make this same kal v’chomer from an asham, which does not bring a kapparah for a chiyuv kares.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Maybe an asham (and all these others) need the north because they are kodshei kodashim, but a Pesach, which is not, would not need the north? So why is “oso” needed? **A:** “Oso” comes to teach as we initially said – the animal must be shechted in the north, but the shochet need not be standing in the north. Although we asked that this is already learned in a Braisa from a different pasuk, we will say that the reason we learn it twice is to teach that although the shochet need not be in the north during the shechita, the Kohen who is doing the kabbalah does need to be in the north when he does the kabbalah.
 - **Q:** This is already known from “v’lakach”, as stated above!? **A:** He does not darshen in this way, and therefore needs the “oso” to teach this.
- **Q:** We now have a source that shechita and kabbalah of an olah must be done in the north. How do we know that this is absolutely essential and that the korbon will be passul if they are not done in the north? **A: R’ Ada bar Ahava** (or **Rabbah bar Shila**) said, we have a kal v’chomer – if a chatas, whose north requirement is only known from an olah, and yet the north requirement is absolutely essential, then the north requirement of an olah itself is surely absolutely essential!
 - **Q:** We can ask that a chatas is different, because it brings a kapparah for aveiros that have a chiyuv kares!? **A: Ravina** said, this is what **R’ Ada bar Ahava** was asking – we never find that the secondary thing is more stringent than the primary thing, so the north requirement of chatas (which is learned out from olah) cannot be more stringent than the north requirement of olah!
 - **Q: Mar Zutra the son of R’ Mari** asked **Ravina**, do we never find that the secondary thing in a kal v’chomer is more stringent than the primary one? The halacha is that maaser sheini may be redeemed, but food purchased with money used to redeem maaser sheini may not be redeemed!? **A:** The case of maaser sheini is different. The reason it can’t be redeemed is because the kedusha that it gets is not strong enough to allow a redemption to take effect.
 - **Q:** The halacha is that one cannot place physical kedusha onto an animal that has a permanent mum, and yet one can put the physical kedusha of temurah onto an animal that has a mum!? **A:** The case of temurah is different. New kedusha comes from chullin, and such kedusha is not strong enough to be effective on a baal mum. When doing temurah, the kedusha is coming from something that is already kadosh. Such kedusha is stronger and can therefore even be effective on a baal mum.
 - **Q:** The halacha is that a Korbon Pesach does not need semicha, nesachim, or tenufah, and yet if it is leftover after Pesach (not having been used for a Korbon Pesach) and is then brought as a korbon it does need semicha, nesachim, and tenufah!? **A:** When it is brought at any time other than Erev Pesach it is actually a shelamim. That is why it has these other requirements.
- We can also say that we know that the north requirement of an olah is absolutely essential based on the word “ha’olah”, which we understand to mean that the olah must always be done in its proper place. If not, it is passul.

-----Daf 49-----

- **Q:** How do we know that an asham must be shechted in the north? **A:** The pasuk says “bimkom asher yishchatu es ha’olah yishchatu es ha’asham”.
 - **Q:** How do we know that the kabbalah of the asham must be done in the north? **A:** The pasuk continues and says “v’es damo yizrok”, which teaches that the kabbalah must be done there as well.
 - **Q:** How do we know that the Kohen doing the kabbalah must also be in the north? **A:** The pasuk could have said “v’damo” and instead says “v’es damo”. This teaches that the Kohen must be in the north as well.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** How do we know that this is absolutely essential? **A:** There is another pasuk regarding the asham of a metzora that says “v’shachat es hakeves” in the place of the chatas and olah. This repetition of the halacha teaches that it is absolutely essential.
 - **Q:** A Braisa uses this pasuk to teach the general rule that when something is part of a group and is then singled out for a special halacha it is no longer considered to be part of the group unless the Torah specifically puts it back as part of the group. If so, it is not available to teach that it is absolutely essential!? **A:** If that pasuk is needed for that, there would be no reason to write the first pasuk that gives the rule in general regarding ashamos that they must be shechted in the north (we would be able to learn it from the metzora’s asham). The fact that it is written in both places proves that it is absolutely essential.
 - **Q:** This could be correct according to the view that when an item is removed from the group it cannot carry characteristics from the group but the group can still carry characteristics from it. However, according to the view that it can’t learn from the group and visa-versa, both pesukim are needed and are not extra to teach that this is essential!? **A:** Since the Torah ultimately returns the metzora’s asham to be part of the general group, it is considered to be returned in full, including for the north requirement. If so, the pasuk is extra and is available to teach that this requirement is essential.
 - **Q: Mar Zutra the son of R’ Mari asked Ravina,** maybe it is only returned to the general group for purposes of it requiring blood applications and having its eimurim burned on the Mizbe’ach, but not for the requirement that the shechita take place in the north!? **A:** If so, the pasuk would have said “ki kachatas hu”. The fact that it says “kachatas ha’asham” teaches that the metzora’s asham should be like all other ashamos for all purposes.
- **Q:** The pasuk of the metzora’s asham compares it to a chatas and to an olah. Why does the Torah compare it to both of these? **A: Ravina** said, if it was only compared to a chatas, we would say that the north requirement of the chatas is itself learned from olah, and something that is learned via a hekesh can then teach via a hekesh as well. The pasuk teaches that it cannot.
 - **Q: Mar Zutra the son of R’ Mari asked Ravina,** if so, let the pasuk simply compare it to an olah and not to a chatas!? **A:** If so, we would learn that something learned via a hekesh can then be used to teach via a hekesh and the reason why the Torah didn’t just compare it to a chatas was because the Torah preferred to make a hekesh with the true source of the halacha. Therefore, the pasuk compared it to chatas and then olah, to teach that something that is learned via a hekesh cannot teach through a hekesh.
 - **Rava** said, this rule (that something learned via a hekesh cannot then teach via a hekesh) is learned from the pasuk “kasher yuram mishor zevach hashelamim”. Why does the pasuk compare the Kohen Gadol’s par to a shelamim? It can’t be to teach that its diaphragm and kidneys are offered, because the pasuk specifies that!? Rather, we learn this halacha from the Kohen Gadol’s par to the par helam davar, and from the par helam davar to the chatas for the sin of avoda zara. Now, that would be something learned from a hekesh then being used to teach via a hekesh. To prevent that from taking place, the pasuk says the extra phrase of “kasher yuram mishor zevach hashelamim”, which makes it as if this halacha is actually written by the par helam davar, and therefore it is no longer considered to be learned from a hekesh.
 - **Q: R’ Pappa asked Rava,** if the Torah was trying to teach this, why didn’t the Torah just actually write the requirement to offer the diaphragm and the kidneys by the par helam davar!? **A:** If the Torah would have done so, we would have said that in truth something learned from a hekesh can then be used to teach via a hekesh and the reason the Torah wrote these requirements explicitly by par helam davar was because it chose to do so, but not that it had to just to allow a hekesh to be made to the chatas for the sin of avoda zara. The Torah therefore wrote the extra phrase which we now see was only

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

written to teach that something learned via a hekesh cannot be used to then teach via a hekesh.

- We have now established that something learned via a hekesh cannot be used to then teach via a hekesh.
 - **Q:** Can something that was learned via a hekesh then teach via a gezeira shava? **A:** There is a halacha regarding tzaraas that is learned via a hekesh and a Braisa then teaches that further via a gezeira shava. We see that this may be done!
 - **R' Yochanan** said, although this is allowed in all other areas of the Torah, this is no proof that this may be done regarding kodashim. This can be proven from the fact that if this was allowed to be done for kodashim, the Torah should not have taught the north requirement regarding ashamei, and we could have learned it from chatas via a gezeira shava! The fact that it does not do so, shows that this is not allowed by kodashim.
 - Something that is learned from a hekesh can then teach through a kal v'chomer. We have learned this earlier from a Braisa taught by the yeshiva of **R' Yishmael**.
 - **Q:** Can something that was learned via a hekesh then teach via a "binyan av"? **A:** **R' Yirmiya** said, if this was allowed, there would be no reason to write the north requirement regarding an ashamei because we could learn it from a binyan av from chatas. The reason that the Torah wrote it by ashamei must be because something that was learned via a hekesh cannot then teach via a "binyan av".
 - **Q:** According to you, why don't we learn out ashamei from a binyan av from olah? The reason is that we would say that olah is different because it is totally burned on the Mizbe'ach. Similarly, the reason we could not learn ashamei with a binyan av from chatas may be because chatas is different, because it brings a kapparah for aveiros that carry kares! Therefore, there is no proof that we cannot darshen in this way.
 - **Q:** We see that we could not learn out one of these korbanos from any other. What about learning out one from the other two with a tzad hashava? **A:** We could not learn olah from chatas and ashamei, because they are different in that they bring a kapparah. We could not learn chatas from olah and ashamei, because they are different in that they are brought from male animals. We could also not learn ashamei from olah and chatas, because they are brought by the tzibbur as well.

-----Daf 50-----

- **Q:** Can something that was learned via a gezeira shava then be used to teach via a hekesh? **A:** **R' Pappa** said, we learn from a gezeira shava that one may use maaser sheini money to bring a shelmim. We then learn from a hekesh to shelmim that a korban todah may likewise be purchased with maaser sheini money. We see that something that was learned via a gezeira shava can then be used to teach via a hekesh.
 - **Q:** **Mar Zutra the son of R' Mari** asked **Ravina**, our question was whether this may be done in matters of kodashim, so the proof from maaser sheini, which is chullin, does not answer the question!? **A:** **Ravina** said, the fact that the items that are teaching are kodashim (shelmim and todah) this shows that this form of teaching may be done by kodashim as well.
 - **Q:** Can something that was learned via a gezeira shava then be used to teach via another gezeira shava? **A:** **Rami bar Chama** said, a Braisa says that we learn that the "challos" type of breads brought with a todah must be brought from "soles" (fine flour) based on a gezeira shava from the "revucha" breads. We then learn that the "rekikin" breads must also be brought from fine flour based on a gezeira shava from the challos breads. We see that something that was learned via a gezeira shava can then be used to teach via another gezeira shava.
 - **Q:** **Ravina** said, this is no proof. It may be that the gezeira shava for rekikin is actually learned from another type of mincha, which the pasuk explicitly says must be brought from "soles". **A:** Rather, **Rava** said we can bring a proof from a Braisa. The Braisa says, the pasuk teaches that the Kohen Gadol's par is taken out of the Azarah whole. We would think that it should be burned whole as well. However, a gezeira shava teaches that just as the olah is burned after it is cut into pieces, the same is with this par. In another Braisa **Rebbi** learns a gezeira shava to teach that just as this par is burned after it is cut into pieces, the same is true for the Yom Kippur par and goat.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

We see from here that **Rebbi** says that something that was learned via a gezeira shava can then be used to teach via another gezeira shava.

- **Q:** Can something that was learned via a gezeira shava then be used to teach via a kal v'chomer? **A:** We can answer this by making a kal v'chomer – if something learned from a hekesh can't be taught further through another hekesh, and yet it can be taught further through a kal v'chomer, then something learned from a gezeira shava, which can then be taught via a hekesh, as **R' Pappa** showed, can surely then be taught via a kal c'chomer!
 - **Q:** What about those who don't agree with **R' Pappa's** proof? **A:** We can answer this by making a kal v'chomer – if something learned from a hekesh can't be taught further through another hekesh, and yet it can be taught further through a kal v'chomer, then something learned from a gezeira shava, which can then be taught via another gezeira shava, can surely be taught further via a kal v'chomer!
- **Q:** Can something that was learned via a gezeira shava then be used to teach via a binyan av? This remains a **TEIKU**.
- **Q:** Can something that was learned via a kal v'chomer then be used to teach via a hekesh? **A:** We can answer this by making a kal v'chomer – if a gezeira shava, which cannot be learned from something taught by a hekesh, yet it can teach through a hekesh based on the proof of **R' Pappa**, then a kal v'chomer, which can be learned from something taught by a hekesh, can surely also teach through a hekesh!
 - **Q:** What about those who don't agree with **R' Pappa's** proof? This remains a **TEIKU**.
 - **Q:** Can something that was learned via a kal v'chomer then be used to teach via a gezeira shava? **A:** We can answer this by making a kal v'chomer – if a gezeira shava, which cannot be learned from something taught by a hekesh, yet it can teach through a gezeira shava, then a kal v'chomer, which can be learned from something taught by a hekesh, can surely also teach through a gezeira shava!
 - **Q:** Can something that was learned via a kal v'chomer then be used to teach via a kal v'chomer? **A:** We can answer this by making a kal v'chomer – if a gezeira shava, which cannot be learned from something taught by a hekesh, yet it can teach through a kal v'chomer, then a kal v'chomer, which can be learned from something taught by a hekesh, can surely also teach through a kal v'chomer! In fact, this would be the case of a "kal v'chomer ben kal v'chomer".
 - **Q:** This would actually not be a "ben kal v'chomer" (a second generation kal v'chomer), but would rather be a "ben beno shel kal v'chomer" (it is third generation, because the whole two generations were based on the kal v'chomer that a gezeira shava may be followed by a kal v'chomer)!? **A:** Rather, we can make a different kal v'chomer – if a hekesh, which cannot learn from a hekesh, can still teach through a kal v'chomer, then a kal v'chomer, which can learn from a hekesh, can surely teach through a kal v'chomer! Now, this would be the case of a "kal v'chomer ben kal v'chomer".
 - **Q:** Can something that was learned via a kal v'chomer then be used to teach via a binyan av? **A:** **R' Yirmiya** said, we can bring a proof from a Mishna, where **R' Meir** says that if a Kohen did melika on a bird korbon and it was then found to be a treifah, it will not cause tumah if swallowed (normally a bird treifah causes tumah when swallowed). **R' Meir** says there is a kal v'chomer – if regarding an animal, whose neveilah causes tumah to a person who touches or carries it, and yet shechita of an animal that is a treifa prevents it from causing tumah, then regarding a bird, whose neveilah does not cause tumah through touching or carrying, the shechita of a bird that is a treifa will surely prevent it from causing any tumah. Now, with a binyan av we extend this to melika as well. Shechita makes a bird mutar to eat and also makes the bird that is a treifa not cause any tumah, so too melika, which makes the bird mutar to eat will also make the bird that is a treifa not cause any tumah! We see from here that **R' Meir** used a kal v'chomer followed by a binyan av!
 - The Gemara says, this is not actually a proof. First of all, **R' Meir** actually relies on a hekesh that compares melika to shechita, not the binyan av. Second of all, even if he was relying on the binyan av, the shechita he is basing this on is a shechita of chullin, and as such can't be the basis that one can learn this way regarding kodashim.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf נ"א--51-----

- **Q:** If something is learned from a binyan av, can it then be taught through a hekesh, a gezeira shava, a kal v'chomer, or another binyan av? **A:** We can answer one of these from a Braisa. The Braisa says, that if blood of a korbon is kept past sundown it is still considered to be valid in the sense that if it is brought up onto the Mizbe'ach it would not be taken down. We learn this from a binyan av from eimurim of a korbon that are left past sundown, that they remain valid in the sense that if they are brought up onto the Mizbe'ach they would not be taken down. We learn that this is true for eimurim from a binyan av from the meat of a korbon (shelamim) that does not become passul when left overnight. We see that the Braisa takes something that was learned from a binyan av and teaches it further through another binyan av.

SHEYAREI HADAM...

- **Q:** Why would the blood be poured there? **A:** The pasuk says "ehl yesod mizbach ha'olah asher pesach Ohel Moed", which teaches that it should be poured at the part of the Mizbe'ach that he comes upon first when leaving the Ohel Moed.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "ehl yesod mizbach ha'olah" which teaches that it should not be poured on the base of the inside Mizbe'ach. Another pasuk says "ehl yesod mizbach ha'olah", which teaches that the inside Mizbe'ach did not have a base. A third pasuk says "ehl yesod mizbach ha'olah", which teaches that all korbanos that are brought on the outside Mizbe'ach are to have their leftover blood poured onto its base. Maybe this pasuk should be darshened to teach that the olah brought on the outside Mizbe'ach (which gets two blood applications on two opposite corners) should only have its applications on the corners where there is a base? **R' Yishmael** said, we would know this from a kal v'chomer – if the leftover blood, which does not bring a kapparah, must be poured onto the base, then the blood applications, which bring a kapparah, must surely be done in a place where there is a base! **R' Akiva** said the kal v'chomer is – if the leftover blood, that does not bring a kapparah and is not brought for purposes of kapparah, and yet it needs to be poured onto the base, then the blood applications of an olah, which brings a kapparah and is brought for purposes of a kapparah, must certainly be applied on an area where there is a base! Now, according to both of them, if we have a kal v'chomer why do we need the pasuk of "ehl yesod mizbach ha'olah"? It is to teach that all korbanos that are brought on the outside Mizbe'ach are to have their leftover blood poured onto its base.
 - **Q:** How can the Braisa say that the pasuk of "ehl yesod mizbach ha'olah" teaches that it should not be poured on the base of the inside Mizbe'ach? This pasuk is needed to simply teach that the Kohen Gadol's par (which is offered on the inside Mizbe'ach) must have its leftover blood poured on the outside Mizbe'ach!? **A:** That can be learned from the pasuk of "asher pesach Ohel Moed".
 - The Braisa said that the third pasuk comes to teach that all korbanos brought on the outside Mizbe'ach must have their leftover blood poured onto its base. This is because it can't be understood as teaching that the subject of the pasuk (the Nasi's chatas) must have its leftover blood poured onto the base of the outside Mizbe'ach, because the essential avodos of this korbon are done on the outside Mizbe'ach, so this would be obvious. You also can't say that we would have thought that korbanos brought on the inside Mizbe'ach must have their blood poured on the base of the outside Mizbe'ach and therefore korbanos brought on the outside Mizbe'ach must have their leftover blood poured on the inside Mizbe'ach, because the inside Mizbe'ach has no base! Therefore, this pasuk is extra, and it is to be darshened to teach that all korbanos brought on the outside Mizbe'ach must have their leftover blood poured onto its base.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said, Maybe this pasuk should be darshed to teach that the olah brought on the outside Mizbe'ach (which gets two blood applications on two opposite corners) should only have its applications on the corners where there is a base. Now, if the pasuk is referring to the blood applications it should have said "ehl yesod ha'olah", without using the word "mizbach"! **A:** If it would not have said "mizbach" we would have thought that the applications should be done on the vertical wall of the Mizbe'ach. The word "mizbach" teaches that it should be done on the horizontal top (the "roof") of the Mizbe'ach.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 52-----

- The Gemara had quoted a Braisa that discussed the need for three pesukim that say “ehl yesod mizbach ha’olah”. Regarding the third mention of the pasuk the Braisa said, **R’ Yishmael** said, we would not need this pasuk to teach where on the Mizbe’ach the blood of an olah is applied, because we would know this from a kal v’chomer – if the leftover blood, which does not bring a kapparah, must be poured onto the base’s roof (the top of the outside Mizbe’ach), then the blood applications, which bring a kapparah, must surely be done there! **R’ Akiva** said, the kal v’chomer is – if the leftover blood, that does not bring a kapparah and is not brought for purposes of kapparah, and yet it needs to be poured onto the base’s roof, then the blood applications of an olah, which bring a kapparah and are brought for purposes of a kapparah, must certainly be applied there as well! Now, according to both of them, if we have a kal v’chomer, why do we need the pasuk of “ehl yesod mizbach ha’olah”? It is to teach that all korbanos that are brought on the outside Mizbe’ach are to have their leftover blood poured onto its base.
 - **Q:** What is the difference between the view of **R’ Yishmael** and the view of **R’ Akiva**? **A:** **R’ Ada bar Ahava** said, the difference is whether the pouring of the leftover blood is essential (it certainly would not prevent the kapparah from taking place, but possibly must be done to complete the avodah). **R’ Yishmael** holds it is essential and **R’ Akiva** holds it is not. **A2:** **R’ Pappa** said, that all agree that it is not essential. The machlokes would be whether the blood of a chatas bird that must be squeezed from the bird onto the base (this is done after the blood of the bird is thrown at the Mizbe’ach) is essential. **R’ Yishmael** says that it is and **R’ Akiva** says that it is not.
 - There is a Braisa that says like **R’ Pappa**. The Braisa brings **R’ Yishmael’s** drasha of pesukim and of a kal v’chomer which shows that he holds that the pouring of the leftover blood of even chataos that are brought on the inner Mizbe’ach are not essential.
 - **Q:** Does **R’ Yishmael** really hold that the squeezing of the remaining blood of a chatas bird on the Mizbe’ach is essential? It was taught in the yeshiva of **R’ Yishmael** that the pasuk of “v’hanishar badam yimatzei” teaches that if there is remaining blood it should be squeezed out, which suggests that this is not essential!? **A:** The two conflicting Braisos reflect the opinions of two different Tanna’im regarding what **R’ Yishmael** actually held.
- **Rami bar Chama** said, we find the view of a Tanna of a Braisa that holds that the pouring of the leftover blood is an essential avodah. The Braisa says that the word “osah” regarding a chatas teaches that if the blood of a chatas which must be offered on top of the Mizbe’ach was instead offered below the half-point of the Mizbe’ach, the chatas may not be eaten. The Braisa then discusses why a pasuk is necessary to teach this (we would seem to be able to learn this based on logic). As part of this discussion the Braisa says that the blood of a chatas offered on the inside Mizbe’ach is different (that an outside chatas) in that the blood applications on the inside Mizbe’ach do not complete the avodah for that korban. **Rami bar Chama** asked, what does this mean? He said, it means that the avodah is not complete without the leftover blood being poured onto the base of the outside Mizbe’ach. We see that this Tanna holds that this is essential! **Rava** said, this is not what is meant by the Braisa. Rather, the Braisa means that the avodah is not complete without the blood also being thrown towards the paroches. However, it may be that the pouring onto the base of the Mizbe’ach is not essential.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the Yom Kippur korban says “v’chilah mikaper”, **R’ Yehudah** says, this teaches that if the Kohen Gadol did the zerika, the avodah is considered to be complete, but if he did not do that, the avodah is not complete. **R’ Nechemya** said to him, why don’t you instead darshen the words as they are written, which would teach that if he did *all* the avodos then he has achieved the kapparah and if he did not do all the avodos, but instead left out even one blood application, he did not achieve the kapparah!?
 - **Q:** What is the point of machlokes between them? **A:** **R’ Yochanan** and **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** argue – one says they don’t argue in halacha, but rather only argue in how to darshen the pasuk. The other says that they argue as to whether the pouring of the leftover blood is essential.
 - We can prove that it is **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** who is the one who holds that there is a view that the pouring of the leftover blood is essential, because we find that he discusses, that according

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

to the view that the pouring is essential, if the blood spilled before this pouring was done, another animal would have to be brought.

- The Gemara says, this is no proof. We similarly find that **R' Yochanan** also discusses a Tanna who holds this view. Therefore, there is no proof whether it was **R' Yochanan** or **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** who says that the machlokes in this Braisa is based on whether the pouring of the leftover blood is essential.

-----Daf 53-----

MISHNA

- With regard to the chataos of the tzibbur and of individuals, the procedure is as follows. The chataos of the tzibbur (besides the ones discussed in the previous Mishna) are the chatas male goats of Rosh Chodesh and of Yomim Tovim. Their halacha is that the shechita must be done in the north, the kabbalah of their blood must be done in a kli shareis in the north, and the blood requires 4 applications (one each) on the four corners of the outside Mizbe'ach. How is this done? The Kohen goes up the ramp and turns to the ledge and walks on it to the southeast corner of the Mizbe'ach (and applies blood to it), then to the northeast corner, then to the northwest corner, and finally to the southwest corner. The leftover blood is then poured onto the southern base of the Mizbe'ach. These chataos are eaten inside the curtains of the Azarah, by the male Kohanim, eaten in any way they like, for that day and the following night up until chatzos.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How were these blood applications done? **A:** **R' Yochanan** and **R' Elazar** argue – one says it may be placed anywhere within an amah to the corner on either side, and the other says that he applies the blood by placing it downward along the corner itself.
 - According to the view of **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon**, who says that the chatas blood must be applied to the horn on the corner itself, all would agree that the blood need not be placed on the actual corner, but could be placed anywhere on the horn. The machlokes is according to the view of **Rebbi**, who says that the chatas blood can be applied below the horns on the wall of the Mizbe'ach. One says that it can be placed within an amah to the corner, which is opposite the horn above (the horn was an amah by an amah), and the other says it must be placed onto the actual corner.
 - **Q:** A Braisa details the blood application process for the chataos and specifically says that the Kohen places the blood with his finger onto the actual corners of the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** The Braisa means that this is the way it should be done l'chatchila, but it may be that b'dieved it may even be placed within an amah to the corners.
 - **Q:** What is the machlokes between **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** and **Rebbi**? **A:** A Braisa says, **Rebbi** says, blood that must be applied “above” can be applied anywhere above the chut hasikra, and blood that must be applied “below” can be applied anywhere below the chut hasikra. **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** says, that is only true regarding an olah bird (its blood must be offered “above” and can be applied anywhere above the chut hasikra), but the blood of an animal chatas must be applied to the horn of the Mizbe'ach itself.
 - A Mishna says that there was a chut hasikra (a red line) that encircled the Mizbe'ach at its midpoint, which would separate between the “upper bloods” and the “lower bloods”. **R' Acha bar Ketina** shows how we see from a pasuk that the Mizbe'ach is divided in this way to differentiate between the upper and lower bloods.

SHEYAREI HADAM...

- A Braisa says, when the pasuk says that the leftover blood of the chatas offered on the outside Mizbe'ach should be poured on the base of the Mizbe'ach, it refers to the southern base. Maybe we should say that it is the western base, just as the leftover blood of the inside chataos are poured onto the western base!? We learn, that just as the blood of the inside chataos are poured onto the base that is closest to him when he comes from the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Heichal (the western base) so too the blood of an outside chatas is poured onto the base that is closest to him when he comes down the ramp – which is the southern base.

- A Braisa says, **R' Yishmael** says the chatas of Yom Kippur (the inner chataos) and the chatas of all year long (the outer chataos) have their leftover blood spilled on the western base. **R' Shimon ben Yochai** says they are both spilled on the southern base.
 - **Q: R' Yishmael's** view is understandable, since the Torah doesn't say where the chatas of all year should be poured, he says we learn from Yom Kippur that it should be poured on the western base. However, what is **R' Shimon ben Yochai's** reasoning? **A: R' Assi** explains, he holds that the entrance to the Heichal was south of the Mizbe'ach. Therefore, when leaving the Heichal, the first base he would encounter would be the base on the south side.
 - In the yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** they taught a Braisa that said that **R' Shimon ben Yochai** held that the leftover blood of both inside and outside chataos were poured onto the western base.

MISHNA

- An olah is kodshei kodashim. It must be shechted in the north, the kabbalah of its blood must be done into a kli shareis in the north, and its blood is applied with two applications that are like four. The korban must be skinned and cut into pieces and is then burned entirely on the fire of the Mizbe'ach.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is it that the Mishna tells us that an olah is kodshei kodashim, but did not do so with all the other korbanos (like the chatas and ashm, even though they too are kodshei kodashim)? **A:** It is because the pasuk regarding olah does not refer to it as kodshei kodashim.

V'DAMAH TA'UN SHTEI MATANOS

- **Q:** How is this done? **A: Rav** said, the Kohen applies the blood to the wall (throws it from the keili) on one side of the corner and then applies it to the wall on the other side of that corner (on the two opposite corners, thereby covering all 4 walls). **Shmuel** said, he would make one application (would throw it once at each of the two corners) at the actual corner, and the blood would end up on each side of the corner.
 - This is actually the subject of a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding olah says "v'zarku", which would suggest that even one throwing of the blood is enough. The pasuk therefore says "saviv". Now, the word "saviv" would suggest that the blood be applied all around the Mizbe'ach like a thread. The pasuk therefore says "v'zarku", which teaches that it be thrown twice in a way that it reaches all 4 walls. **R' Yishmael** says, the pasuk here says "saviv" and the pasuk regarding the setting up of the Mishkan says "saviv" – just as there it refers to 4 separate applications, the same is here. If so, maybe the olah blood should be applied to all 4 corners, just as the korbanos in that pasuk? That can't be, because the blood of an olah is only offered on corners that have a base and the southeast corner did not have a base. Therefore, the gezeira shava must teach that there are 4 applications, but not that they are done on the four corners.
 - **Q:** Why is it that the southeast corner was the one corner with no base? **A: R' Elazar** said, it is because the place of where the base would be on the south and east sides of the Mizbe'ach would have been in the portion of Shevet Yehudah, not Binyamin, and the Mizbe'ach had to be built solely in the portion of Shevet Binyamin.
 - **R' Levi bar Chama in the name of R' Chama the son of R' Chanina** darshened a pasuk to teach that Binyamin Hatzadik was pained because there was a small strip of land that belonged to Yehudah that reached into the portion of Binyamin all the way to the Mizbe'ach wall. Because he was pained in this way he was zocheh to be the "host" for the Shechinah in his portion.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that when bringing a bird olah the Kohen would go on the ledge to the southeast corner of the Mizbe'ach and squeeze the blood onto that corner. Now, if there was no base there, it is like he is applying the blood in the air, because the blood that did not reach the wall would fall to the ground below!? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, Binyamin and Yehuda had an agreement that the airspace under that area would belong to Binyamin but the ground

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

would belong to Yehuda. Therefore, a small protrusion higher than 3 tefachim was set under that corner to catch any blood that would not reach the wall.

-----Daf 71--54-----

- **Q:** What does it mean when we say that the southeast corner of the Mizbe'ach did not have a base? **A: Rav** said, it means that there was actually no base there. **Levi** said, there was a physical base, but it did not have the status of the rest of the base and could not be used as a base for purposes of blood applications. This machlokes is based on each one's understanding of the Targum which tells of Yaakov's bracha to Binyamin, that said that the Mizbe'ach would be in his portion.
 - **Q:** A Mishna clearly says that the base was only on the north and west sides of the Mizbe'ach and then an amah on the south and east sides. This refutes **Levi**!? **A:** The Mishna means that with regard to a base for the purposes of applying blood, that is where the base was.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that the Mizbe'ach was 32 amos by 32 amos. Now, according to **Rav** the Mizbe'ach was actually not square (because there was no base on two sides)!? **A:** The Mishna means that the north side and west side were each 32 amos.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that the ramp (which was on the south side) extended an amah over the base. According to **Rav** there was no base there!? **A:** It means it extended over the amah corresponding to the base.
 - **Q:** **Levi** taught a Braisa that details how the Mizbe'ach was made. The first step was to use a form that was 32x32 amos, which served as the form for the base. We see that the base was a square of 32 amos. This refutes **Rav**!? **A: Rav** would say that the form in the area that belonged to Yehuda was filled with a solid substance and then removed when the rest of the base was set in place. In fact, we see that this form of construction was used for the horns as well. The horns had to be hollow, which was achieved by putting a solid substance in the middle and then removing the solid substance once the rest of the horn had set in place.
- **Rava** darshened the pesukim that tell of how Shmuel and Dovid decided that Yerushalayim was the proper place for the Beis Hamikdash. The pasuk says that Shmuel and Dovid went to "Nayos Ramah". In truth, these were two different places. Rather, it means that they were in Ramah to discuss the "nayo" (the beauty) of the world (the building of the Beis Hamikdash). They said, the pasuk says "v'kamta v'alisa" which teaches that the Beis Hamikdash should be higher than all other places in Eretz Yisrael. They looked at the description of the borders between the Shevatim in Sefer Yehoshua, and the only one that mentions "going up" was the border between Yehuda and Binyamin. They said, this proves that the Beis Hamikdash belongs there. They thought to build the Beis Hamikdash at Ein Eitam, which is the highest point in that area. They said, the pasuk says that the Beis Hamikdash will be "bein kiseifav shachein", which suggests that it is somewhat lower than the highest point. They therefore decided that it must be meant to be in Yerushalayim. Another reason they chose that spot was because they had a tradition that the Sanhedrin was to be in the portion of Yehuda and the Shechina in the portion of Binyamin, and if the Beis Hamikdash was to be in Ein Eitam, they would have to be some distance from each other. They therefore decided that the proper place was Yerushalayim, which would allow for the Sanhedrin to be situated near the Shechina.