



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

Zevachim Daf Pey Beis

SHEHAYA R' AKIVA OMER...

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the view of **R' Akiva** (that any outside korban whose blood was brought into the Heichal becomes passul, which is based on a pasuk that says that a *chatas* that is supposed to be brought outside and whose blood is then brought inside becomes passul) can be explained with a mashal. If a talmid mixes wine for his rebbi with hot water, and the rebbi then asks the talmid to again mix some wine for him with hot water, that must come to include that the rebbi means that it can even be mixed with cold water, because if he only meant hot water, since that is what was done until now, he didn't have to say anything about the water at all. The fact that he did, meant that he was including cold water as well. The same is with this pasuk. The pasuk is discussing a *chatas*. The pasuk therefore did not have to mention "chatas", since that is what is being discussed. The fact that it did mention *chatas* comes to teach that this halacha applies to all korbanos.
 - **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** asked, right next to this pasuk is the halacha that the keilim used for the korbanos – all types of korbanos – must be purged and rinsed from the korban. Now, if this halacha regarding the blood going into the Heichal was to apply to all korbanos, the pasuk should not have said "chatas" and we would know to apply it to all korbanos. The fact that the pasuk says "chatas" suggests that it is to *only* apply to *chatas* and not to the other korbanos!? If anything, the mashal should be to a talmid who diluted wine for his rebbi using hot and cold water, and the rebbi then said to him – dilute more for me using *only* hot water!? **A:** Rather, **R' Akiva's** view is found in a Braisa and is based on the pasuk "v'chol chatas". Had the pasuk only said "chatas" it would apply only to a *chatas*. Had it said "kol chatas" it would teach to include other kodshei kodashim. Now that it says "v'chol chatas" it comes to include kodshei kalim as well. **R' Yose Haglili** argues in the Braisa and says that "chatas" would only teach regarding a female *chatas*, "kol chatas" would teach regarding the *chatas* of the tzibbur, and "v'chol chatas" teaches regarding a male *chatas*.
 - **Q: R' Yose Haglili** used this pasuk for a different drasha in a Braisa!? **A:** In our Braisa he is talking according to the view of **R' Akiva**, and saying how the pasuk should be darshened.

MISHNA

- With regard to a *chatas* whose blood was caught into two separate keilim, if one of the keilim was taken outside the Azarah, the one that remains inside is still valid. If one of the keilim was brought inside the Heichal, **R' Yose Haglili** says that the one that remained outside is still valid, but the **Chachomim** say it is passul. **R' Yose Haglili** said, if regarding taking it out of the Azarah, where even an intent will make it passul, they did not say that the one that remained in the proper place becomes passul, then with regard to taking it into the Heichal, where an intent would not make it passul, certainly the one that remained in the proper place should not become passul!?
 - If the blood was brought into the Heichal with intent to offer it as a kapparah, **R' Eliezer** says that even if it was not actually offered it becomes passul. **R' Shimon** says it does not become passul unless it is actually offered inside the Heichal. **R' Yehuda** says if it was brought in b'shogeg it is valid.
- All passul bloods that are offered on the Mizbe'ach are not made effective by the tzitz, except for tamei blood, because the tzitz makes valid for acceptance blood that is tamei, but does not do so for blood that was taken out of the Azarah (or any other psul).

- A Braisa says that **R' Yose Haglili** proves his point with a kal v'chomer – if in a place where intent makes it passul – outside the Azarah – still the blood brought outside will not make the blood that is left inside passul, then a place where intent does not make it passul – inside the Heichal – certainly the blood brought inside should not make the blood left in the Azarah passul. The **Rabanan** said to him, the pasuk says “asher yuvah midamah”, which suggests that if even part of the blood was brought inside the Heichal the entire korbon becomes passul. **R' Yose Haglili** said to them, based on this we should make a kal v'chomer to teach that if the blood going into the Heichal makes the entire korbon passul, then when the blood leaves the Azarah it should certainly make the entire korbon passul!? The **Rabanan** said to him, “asher yuvah” teaches that only the blood that is brought into the Heichal makes the whole korbon passul, but blood that is taken out of the Azarah will not make the whole korbon passul (when there is other blood to offer).
 - **Q:** We should use the kal v'chomer to say that an intent to offer the blood inside the Heichal should make the korbon passul – if an intent to offer it out of the Azarah makes the korbon passul, even though if it is brought out of the Azarah it doesn't make the blood left inside passul, then an intent to offer it in the Heichal, where bringing the blood into the Heichal does make it passul, should certainly make the korbon passul!? **A:** The pasuk of “bayom hashlishi” teaches that only intent for outside the Azarah makes it passul.
 - **Q:** We should use the kal v'chomer to teach that intent to offer the blood outside the Azarah does not make the korbon passul!? **A:** The pasuk says “shlishi” which teaches regarding beyond its time intent, and says “pigul” which teaches regarding beyond its place intent.
- A Braisa says, korbon meat that goes outside its allowable area becomes passul. If it goes inside the Heichal it is valid. Now, we would have said based on the kal v'chomer (as taught above) that when meat is brought into the Heichal it should certainly become passul. The pasuk therefore says “midamah”, that it is only when blood is brought into the Heichal that it becomes passul, but meat brought into the Heichal does not become passul. We would then think to use the kal v'chomer to teach that if when meat is brought into the Heichal it remains valid, then when it leaves the Azarah it should also remain valid!? The pasuk therefore says “ubasar basadeh treifah lo socheilu”, which teaches that when the meat is brought outside of its permitted area it becomes passul.
- A Braisa says, when the pasuk says “pnimah” it teaches that blood of a chatas becomes passul when it is brought into the Kodshei HaKodashim. The words “ehl haKodesh pnima” teaches that it becomes passul even when it is brought into the Heichal.
 - **Q:** Why not just write “kodesh” and we would know that if it is passul when brought into the Heichal it is certainly passul when brought into the Kodesh HaKodashim? **A:** **Rava** said, if we only had the word “kodesh” we would say that refers to the Kodesh HaKodashim. It is only because we have the word “pnima” that we can then say that “kodesh” refers to the Heichal. We find this concept in a Braisa regarding a Jewish slave of a Kohen not being allowed to eat terumah. The Braisa says that the pasuk teaches that if a Kohen owns a Jewish slave who is to go out free at 6 years, the slave may not eat terumah, and a Jewish slave who will be remaining until Yovel may also not eat terumah. The Braisa asks that the pasuk should only teach regarding the slave who is to be there until Yovel and we will then know that the slave who is only there for 6 years may surely not eat as terumah as well? The Braisa answers that if we would only have one teaching we would assume that it is teaching regarding the 6 year slave (which is a smaller chidush). Therefore, we need two teachings so that we know to apply this teaching to a Yovel slave as well.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, the case of the slaves are two different people, and although we could have learned it from a kal v'chomer the Torah decided to write it out anyway. However, in the case of the Kodesh HaKodashim we don't need a pasuk, because it can only get there by going through the Heichal, and once it enters the Heichal it is passul!? **A:** Rather, **Abaye** said that the pasuk is needed for a case where the blood bypassed the Heichal by being brought in on the rooftops. In that case we need to be taught that it becomes passul when it

enters the Kodesh Hakodashim, and even though that could be learned from a kal v'chomer, the Torah went ahead and wrote it out specifically anyway.

- **Q: Rava** asked, the pasuk uses verbiage of “bringing” which suggests that it only becomes passul when it enters through a normal entrance!?
A: Rather, **Rava** said that anything that the Kohen intended to bring into the Kodesh HaKodashim would not become passul by entering the Heichal.

- **Q: Rava** asked, what is the halacha regarding the blood of the par helam, or of the goat brought for the sin of avoda zarah (these bloods are offered in the Heichal), that is brought into the Kodesh HaKodashim? Do we say that since they do not become passul in the Heichal they do not become passul in the Kodesh HaKodashim either, or do we say that they still do? If we say that they still become passul, what about the par and sa'ihir of Yom Kippur, which is offered inside the Kodesh HaKodashim, and is then brought out to the Heichal, and he then took it (improperly) back into the Kodesh HaKodashim? Do we say that it does not become passul, because that is still called its proper place, or do we say that since it should not have been brought back it still becomes passul? If we say that it still becomes passul, what if the blood was sprinkled on the paroches, was then applied to the inside Mizbe'ach, and was then walked back deeper into the Heichal towards the paroches? Is that all called within the Heichal and is therefore valid, or do we say that further out in the Heichal and closer in are different places and the blood is therefore considered to have gone back in and becomes passul? **TEIKU.**