



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

Zevachim Daf Pey Aleph

- **Abaye** said, the machlokes between **R' Eliezer and the Rabanan** is only where the initial blood of a chatas and an olah became mixed (the chatas blood must be applied above and the olah blood must be applied below, and they argue whether the mixture may be applied above and then below). However, if the leftover blood of a chatas became mixed with blood of an olah, all would agree that the blood may be applied below, since both of these bloods must be applied below. **R' Yosef** said, **R' Yehuda** has said that the leftover chatas blood must be poured onto the base, whereas the olah blood must be applied to the wall of the Mizbe'ach, and therefore the **Rabanan** would say that even in this case the blood should be poured out into the amah and not applied.
 - **R' Shimon** said the same as **Abaye**, and **R' Yochanan** (or **R' Elazar**) said like **R' Yosef**.
 - **Q: R' Huna bar Yehuda** asked, a Braisa says, the pasuk regarding bechor says "kodesh heim", which teaches that if the blood of a bechor is mixed with the blood of other korbanos, it can still be offered. Presumably this even refers to where the initial blood of a bechor became mixed with the leftover blood of an olah, and we see that the lower part of the Mizbe'ach (where the bechor is offered) is considered to be the place where the leftover bloods are supposed to be applied as well!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to the *initial* blood of an olah that became mixed with the initial blood of a bechor. The pasuk is teaching us that korbanos are not mevateil each other (even if the blood of one is more than the blood of another).
 - **Q:** We already learn this concept from the pasuk of "v'lakach midam hapar umidam hasa'ih"!? **A:** It is a machlokes among Tanna'im as to where we learn this from.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, a Braisa learns from the extra two words "dam" in the pasuk that if the blood of an olah and bechor became mixed, the blood is still offered. Presumably this even refers to where the initial blood of a bechor became mixed with the leftover blood of an olah, and we see that the lower part of the Mizbe'ach (where the bechor is offered) is considered to be the place where the leftover bloods are supposed to be applied as well!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to the *initial* blood of an olah that became mixed with the initial blood of a bechor. The pasuk is teaching us that korbanos are not mevateil each other (even if the blood of one is more than the blood of another).
 - **Q:** We already learn this concept from the pasuk of "v'lakach midam hapar umidam hasa'ih"!? **A:** It is a machlokes among Tanna'im as to where we learn this from.
 - The others did not want to learn from the pasuk of "v'lakach", because they hold that the pasuk does not refer to mixing the bloods of the animals. The others did not want to learn from the extra words of "dam" because they feel that those words are not meant to teach a drasha. The others did not want to learn from "kodesh heim", because they darshen that to teach that the bechor is offered but the temurah of a bechor is not offered, which is something that the other Tanna learns from another pasuk.
 - **Q:** The Braisa quoted earlier said, if the Kohen didn't ask and just applied the blood above the line, the **Rabanan and R' Eliezer** would agree that he should then apply the blood below the line, and both applications are effective. Presumably this refers to where a chatas and an olah were mixed together, and since it was offered above, only the leftover of the chatas and the initial blood of the olah remains, and the fact that all agree that it should be offered below proves that the lower part of the Mizbe'ach

(where the olah is offered) is considered to be the place where the leftover bloods are supposed to be applied as well!? **A: R' Yitzchak bar Yosef** said, in EY they said that the case is where the blood of an outer chatas and the leftover blood of an inner chatas became mixed. Therefore, after the application above the line, all that remains is the leftover bloods of two chatas. That is why he can simply apply them both below.

- **Q: Abaye** asked, why not answer that the blood of an outer chatas became mixed with the leftover blood of another outer chatas – why do you need to say it was an inner chatas? **A:** It could be he was teaching that even according to the view that it is essential that the leftover blood of an inner chatas be poured, it will be valid even though some of this leftover blood was missing (because it was first offered above).
- **Q: Rava Tosfa'ah** asked **Ravina**, we explained that the Braisa is discussing a case where there was more upper blood than lower blood and the Kohen applied blood above in the amount of all the lower blood plus a little bit. If so, it may be that there is no olah blood remaining and the application below is therefore done only for the leftover chatas blood!? Why do we need to say that the Braisa refers to the chatas mixed with another chatas? **A: Ravina** said, that was said only according to the initial understanding that **R' Eliezer** holds ein bilah.

MISHNA

- If blood that must be applied inside the Heichal became mixed with blood that must be applied outside the Heichal, the mixture should be poured into the amah. If the Kohen instead took the mixture and applied it outside and then again inside, it is valid. If he first applied it inside and then outside, **R' Akiva** says it would be passul and the **Chachomim** say it would be valid (except if it was a chatas). For **R' Akiva** says, all bloods that were brought into the Heichal for kapparah become passul, but the **Chachomim** say this is only true for a chatas. **R' Eliezer** says it is also true for an asham, based on the hekesh of “kachatas ka'asham”.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why doesn't **R' Eliezer** argue regarding the mixing of inside and outside bloods and say that they also don't have to be poured into the amah? **A:** He can't say to first apply outside and then inside, because just as it is a mitzvah to first apply a korban that needs above the line and then a korban that needs below, it is similarly a mitzvah to first offer a korban that needs to be offered inside and then to offer the korban that needs to be offered outside. He also can't categorically say that the blood should first be offered inside and then outside, because he holds that a chatas and an asham would be passul in this situation. Therefore, he did not argue in the Mishna.