



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

Zevachim Daf Tes Vuv

- **Ulla in the name of R' Yochanan** said, a holacha done not by foot is not a valid holacha. We see that **R' Yochanan** held that if done in this way it cannot be rectified.
 - **Q: R' Nachman** asked **Ulla**, a Mishna says, if the blood spilled from the kli shareis onto the floor and the Kohen then picked it up it is valid. Now, surely some of the blood moved towards the Mizbe'ach when it fell out of the keili, and we see that even though this blood moved there without a holacha done by foot it is still valid!? **A:** The Mishna is talking about where the blood spilled in the direction *away* from the Mizbe'ach.
 - **Q:** When a liquid spills it goes in all directions!? **A:** The case is where it spilled on an incline that inclined away from the Mizbe'ach. Or we can say that it spilled into a hole and therefore did not spread from there. Or we can say that the Mishna is talking about a case where the blood was very thick and therefore did not spread once it fell on the ground.
 - **Q:** Would the Tanna teach a case that has such narrow application? Also, when the later Mishna wants to give the corresponding case of where it would be passul it gives the case of where it spills onto the floor before ever being placed into a kli shareis. Now, why didn't it just say that in both cases it spilled after being in a kli shareis, but when it falls towards the Mizbe'ach it is passul and when it falls away it is valid!? This is a **TEYUFTA** of **Ulla**.
- We have learned, the question of whether a holacha not by foot is valid is actually the machlokes between **R' Shimon and the Rabanan** in our Mishna. All would agree that improper intent during a long holacha (a holacha by foot) would make the korbon into piggul. The machlokes is when there was only a short holacha (he put the blood on the Mizbe'ach by just stretching out his hand). **R' Shimon** would hold this is not a holacha and that is why an improper intent had during that would not make it piggul, and the **Rabanan** would hold that it is a holacha, and that is why it would become piggul.
 - **Q:** In EY they laughed at this understanding of **R' Shimon's** view. If **R' Shimon** holds that a short holacha is not a holacha, then in the case of a bird chatas how would it ever become piggul (and we know that it can)!? If he had an improper intent before the blood came out of the bird, it would not make it piggul (because that is considered to be a short holacha). If he had the improper thought after the blood came out of the bird (but before the blood reached the Mizbe'ach), at that point the mitzvah is already done and it can no longer become piggul!? **A:** We can say that it can become piggul for an intent had between the time the blood leaves the bird and before it hits the Mizbe'ach. In fact, we find that the avodah is not considered completed until the blood reaches the Mizbe'ach. **R' Zeira** said that if a Kohen did zrika and his hand was cut off before the blood reached the Mizbe'ach (making him a baal mum), the zrika would be passul based on a pasuk. Based on this, this could not have been the reason that they laughed in EY.
 - **R' Pappa and R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** came from **Rav** and said, the reason they laughed is because in our Mishna they are clearly arguing about a case of a long holacha! Rather, it is regarding a short holacha that all agree that an improper intent would not make the korbon into piggul. It is regarding an intent had during the long holacha that there is a machlokes.
- If the holacha was done by a non-Kohen, and a Kohen then took the blood back to the starting point and did the holacha again, there is a machlokes between the sons of **R' Chiya** and **R' Yannai** – one says it is valid, because the holacha can be rectified and the other says it is passul, because it cannot be rectified.

- If a Kohen did the holacha and a non-Kohen then took the blood back to the starting point and did the holacha again, **R' Simi bar Ashi** said, the one who in the previous case said it was valid would hold in this case that it is passul, and visa-versa. **Rava** said, that even the one who said it was passul in the previous case would hold that it is passul in this case as well, because once the blood is taken back to the starting point it is necessary to take it back to the Mizbe'ach, and therefore a full holacha is needed for the second trip as well.
 - **R' Yirmiya** said to **R' Ashi** that **R' Yirmiya MiDifti** said, whether the second trip to the Mizbe'ach is considered to be the avodah of holacha is actually a machlokes between **R' Eliezer and the Rabanan** in our Mishna, based on the explanation of **Rava**, who says that they agree that if after the kabbalah the Kohen walked further away from the Mizbe'ach that would be an unnecessary walking and an improper intent would therefore not make it piggul. The machlokes is where it was brought to the Mizbe'ach and then taken away. In that case the **Rabanan** say that the second trip to the Mizbe'ach is considered to be a full holacha and **R' Eliezer** holds that it is not.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that the case of an unnecessary holacha according to **R' Eliezer** is where after the kabbalah the Kohen takes it farther away from the Mizbe'ach. This suggests that if after taking it to the Mizbe'ach he then takes it away, the return trip *would* be a necessary holacha!? **A: Rava** said, if that is what the Braisa says, I retract my explanation.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL HAZEVACHIM

PEREK KOL HAZEVACHIM SHEKIBLU DAMAN -- PEREK SHEINI

MISHNA

- If the kabbalah of the blood of a korbon was done by a non-Kohen, an onein, a tvul yom, a mechusar kippurim, by a Kohen who wasn't wearing all the bigdei Kehunah, or one who didn't wash his hands and feet, or did not have a bris milah, or who was tamei, or who was sitting, or was standing on keilim, or on an animal, or on someone else's feet, the kabbalah is passul. If he did the kabbalah with his left hand it is passul, but **R' Shimon** says it would be valid.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that the avodah of a zar (non-Kohen) is passul? **A: Levi** taught, the pasuk says "daber ehl Aharon v'ehl banav v'yinazru mikadshei Bnei Yisrael v'lo yichalilu". The pasuk speaks of a tamei Kohen and teaches that he may not do the avodah of a korbon of the Bnei Yisrael. Now, what do the words "Bnei Yisrael" come to exclude? It can't exclude the korbanos of women, because those can't be brought by a tamei Kohen! It also can't come to exclude the korbon of a goy, because even the tzitz (which normally helps to make valid a korbon that was offered when tamei) doesn't help for a goy, so certainly we can't say that his korbon can be brought by a tamei Kohen!? **A:** Rather, the pasuk should be understood as follows – "v'yinazru mikadshei" – teaches that a tamei Kohen may not bring any korbon, and "Bnei Yisrael v'lo yichalilu" teaches that a zar may not do any of the Avodos.