



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

Zevachim Daf Lamed Ches

- 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 korbon 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 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.
 - **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.