



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

Zevachim Daf Lamed Zayin

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 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.
 - **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.