



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

Zevachim Daf Lamed Tes

- 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 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 Moshi'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'chipar" 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.