



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

Zevachim Daf Tzaddik Beis

PEREK DAM CHATAS -- PEREK ACHAD ASSAR

MISHNA

- If chatas blood splattered onto a garment, it must be washed. Even though the pasuk is written regarding the chataos that are eaten, as the pasuk says "b'makom kadosh tei'acheil", the same halacha would apply to chataos offered on the inside Mizbe'ach, which are not eaten. This is taught by the pasuk of "Torah achas", which teaches that there is one rule for all chataos.
- If blood of a passul chatas splattered onto a garment, it would not need to be washed. This is true whether the chatas had a period of validity or not.
 - What is an example of something that had a period of validity? It would be a korbon that became passul through linah, or that became tamei, or that went out of the Azarah. What is an example of something that did not have a period of validity? It would be a korbon that was shechted with intent for it to be consumed beyond its allowable time or place, or where a passul person did the kabbalah.

GEMARA

- **Q:** If "Torah achas" teaches that all chataos have the same rule, we should say that this rule even applies to a bird chatas as well!? However a Braisa says that the word "zos" teaches that this rule does not apply to a bird chatas!? **A: Reish Lakish in the name of Bar Kappara** said, the pasuk says "tishacheit", which teaches that the pasuk is referring to korbanos that are shechted, which excludes birds.
 - **Q:** We should similarly say that "b'makom kadosh tei'acheil" teaches that this only applies to chataos that are eaten!? **A:** The pasuk says "Toras", to include even the inside chataos.
 - **Q:** If so, it should include chatas birds as well!? **A:** We have the exclusionary word "zos". Since we have to include one group and exclude one group, it makes sense to include the inside chataos, because they are also animals, are shechted in the north of the Azarah, have kabbalah in a keili, have their blood applied to the horn on the corner, with the Kohen's finger, on the actual point of the corner, and they have parts that are burned on the Mizbe'ach.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should rather include bird chataos, because they are offered outside the Heichal and are eaten like a regular chatas!? **A:** The inside chataos are similar to the regular chataos in many more ways.
 - **R' Yosef** said, the pasuk says "yochlena" (he shall eat *it*), which is exclusionary and teaches that this rule only applies to this type of eaten chatas, not any other type.
 - **Q:** Based on this, why do we need the exclusion of "zos"? **A:** Without "zos" we would think that "yochlena" is not exclusionary, but is simply the style of writing of the pasuk.
 - **Rabbah** said, the pasuk says "asher yizeh", which we darshen to teach that the pasuk is referring to chataos whose blood is *sprinkled* – which therefore includes an inner chatas, but not a bird chatas.
 - **Q:** The Mishna said that the pasuk is only speaking of chataos which are eaten, so how can **Rabbah** say it even speaks of the inside chataos!? **A:** The Mishna means that with regard to the halachos of "merika and shtifa" (purging and rinsing) the pasuk only refers to chataos which are eaten. However, with regard to

washing, the words “asher yizeh” refer to all chatas whose blood are sprinkled – which therefore refers to the inside chatas and the outside chatas.

- **Q:** If so, the main teaching is regarding the inner chatas, and the Mishna should therefore say that this rule applies to “inside chatas and chatas that are eaten” instead of saying that this rule applied to “chatas that are eaten and inside chatas”!? **A:** Read the Mishna to say that.
- **Q:** The blood of the bird chatas is also sprinkled and should therefore be included in this rule!? **A:** The pasuk of “zos” excludes it.
- **Q:** The word “zos” should exclude the outside chatas as well!? **A:** The word “Toras” includes them. Since we have to include one group and exclude one group, it makes sense to include the outside chatas, because they are also animals, are shechted in the north of the Azarah, have kabbalah in a keili, have their blood applied to the horn on the corner, with the Kohen’s finger, on the actual point of the corner, and they have parts that are burned on the Mizbe’ach.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should rather include bird chatas, because their blood is sprinkled!? **A:** The outside chatas are similar to the inside chatas in many more ways.
- **Q: R’ Avin** asked, what is the halacha regarding a bird chatas whose blood was brought into the Heichal while it was still on its neck (not having been put into a kli shareis)? Do we say that its neck is like a kli shareis and it therefore becomes passul when it enters the Heichal, or do we say that its neck is like the neck of an animal chatas, and we learn from “midamah” that if the blood of an animal chatas entered the Heichal while still on the animal’s neck it would not become passul? **A:** A Braisa says, that if after the melika the spasms of the bird made it enter the Heichal and then go back into the Azarah, it remains valid. This suggests that if it didn’t enter on its own, but was rather brought in by a Kohen it would become passul, even though the blood is still on its neck.
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. The Braisa also discusses kodshei kodashim that left the north part of the Azarah after the shechita due to its spasms and says that it would be valid. Now, in that case it is clear that it would be valid even if the Kohen brought it there. The reason it speaks in terms of spasms is for a different case of the Braisa – where kodshei kalim left the Azarah due to a spasm. In that case if the Kohen took it out it would become passul. Similarly regarding the bird, it may be that even if the Kohen took it there it would be valid.
- **Q: R’ Avin** asked, what is the halacha if the blood of the bird chatas spilled from the neck onto the Azarah floor and was then gathered into a kli shareis? Do we say that normally the blood is not put into a kli shareis because it is not required, but it may be done, and therefore this would be valid, or do we say that this blood becomes passul if put into a kli shareis, and therefore in this case it would be passul? **A: Rava** said, the Braisa quoted earlier said that “zos” excludes the requirement to wash the blood of a bird chatas from a garment. Now, if the blood becomes passul in a kli shareis, it should become passul as soon as it enters the airspace of the garment (which is a keili), and if it becomes passul we have learned that there is no requirement of washing. If so, why is the word “zos” needed to exclude? It must be that it does not become passul in a keili.
 - **R’ Huna the son of R’ Yehoshua** said, this is not a valid proof. The word “zos” would still be needed for a case where the garment touched the blood while still on the neck. In that case the blood never became passul. That is when the exclusionary “zos” would be needed.
- **Q: Levi** asked **Rebbi**, what if the blood of an animal chatas splattered onto a garment, and then went from that garment onto a second garment, would that second garment be required to be

washed? Do we say that when the blood enters the first garment it becomes passul for zrika and therefore will not make the second garment be subject to washing, or do we say that even in the garment it remains valid for zrika (if it is squeezed out) and therefore would require that the second garment be washed as well? **A: Rebbi** said, this is a good question. The answer is, that in any case the second garment would require a washing. If the blood in the first garment is still valid for zrika, the second garment must be washed because the blood is still valid. Even if it becomes passul in the first garment, I hold like **R' Akiva** who says that if the blood had a period of validity and then became passul, a garment on which such blood splattered would require a washing.