



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

Zevachim Daf Tzaddik Gimmel

- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked **R' Chisda**, what is the halacha if blood from the korbon splattered onto a tamei garment? Would it have to be washed? [**R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** explained, it must be that he holds that when we say that blood that had a period of validity and is now passul, such blood would not need to be washed from a garment, that is only when it first became passul and then splattered onto the garment. However, in this case it touched the garment and becomes tamei at the same time, and therefore maybe it is different]. **A: R' Chisda** said, this is actually a matter of machlokes in a Braisa between **R' Elazar and the Rabanan** according to the view of **Rabbah** as explained by **Abaye**. The Braisa says, **R' Elazar** says that chatas water (parah adumah water) that became tamei can still make a person tahor, since we find that the chatas water can be sprinkled onto a niddah to make her tahor (even though she makes the water tamei). **Rabbah** said, **R' Elazar** is following the view of his rebbi **R' Akiva** who says that when chatas water passes over a place that is tamei, it becomes tamei just as if it came to rest on that place (therefore in **R' Elazar's** case the water became tamei before it landed on the niddah, and it is therefore a valid proof that waters that were tamei before they touched the person can still make the person tahor). **Abaye** asked that a Braisa says that **R' Akiva** agrees that if chatas water is sprinkled over a tamei keili or similar item, that the water remains tahor!? Rather, **Abaye** said that even **R' Akiva** agrees that when chatas water passes through an airspace of something that is tamei it does not become tamei as if it landed there. Rather, **R' Akiva** in the Braisa holds that when the water is *passed* over the tamei keili we are goizer that it is tamei. However, in a case where it is *sprinkled* over a tamei object, we are not goizer. Based on this understanding of **R' Akiva**, **Abaye** said that the machlokes between **R' Elazar and the Rabanan** is whether we can learn the case of chatas water that became tamei before it was sprinkled from a case of chatas water that became tamei at the time that the sprinkling is effective (when it touches the niddah). **R' Elazar** says we could learn the former from the latter and the **Rabanan** say that we cannot. **R' Chisda** is saying that according to **R' Elazar** we would say that the blood that splattered onto a tamei garment would not need to be washed out (it is no different than if the blood was already tamei and was then sprinkled onto the garment).
 - **Rava** said, we can say that even **R' Elazar** holds that we cannot compare the cases of where it becomes tamei as it becomes effective from a case of where it was previously tamei. Rather, the machlokes is that **R' Elazar** holds that there is a minimum required amount of chatas water needed to be effective, and that minimum amount may be reached from multiple sprinklings. Therefore, when less than that amount is sprinkled onto a niddah it becomes tamei before it is effective (it is not effective until completion of the minimum required amount). Since this is effective for the niddah, it proves that tamei chatas water is effective. The **Rabanan** say there is no minimum required amount, and therefore we only see a case of where it becomes tamei at the same time it becomes effective, and there is nothing that can be taught from there to a case of where it was previously tamei.

CHATAS PESULAH...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk of "midamah" teaches that the garment only requires washing if the blood was valid, not if it was passul. **R' Akiva** says, if it had a period of validity and then became passul it would still require washing, but if not, it would not. **R' Shimon** says, in either case it would not require washing.
 - **R' Shimon's** view is based on the two exclusionary words of "osah" and "midamah". One can be used to teach that there is no requirement of washing even if it had a period of validity.

- **R' Akiva** uses the word "osah" to exclude terumah from the requirement of purging and rinsing, mentioned in the preceding pasuk. **R' Shimon** doesn't need the pasuk to teach this, because he says that even kodashim kalim don't need purging and rinsing, so certainly terumah would not need it.

MISHNA

- If blood splattered directly from the neck onto the garment, it does not require washing. If it splattered from the horn on the corner or from the base, it does not require washing. If it splattered from blood that had spilled onto the floor and was then gathered up, it also does not require washing. The blood that would require washing is blood that had a kabbalah into a kli shareis and is fit for zrika.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, we would think that even if it splattered onto a garment directly from the neck it should require washing. The pasuk therefore says "asher yizeh", which teaches that it must be blood that is fit to be used for zrika.
- Another Braisa says, we would think that even if it splattered onto a garment directly from the horn on the corner of the Mizbe'ach or from the base, it should require washing. The pasuk therefore says "asher yizeh", which teaches that it must be blood that was not already used for the zrika.

NISHPACH AHL HARITZPAH...

- **Q:** Why is this general rule needed to be taught as well? **A:** It is giving the reason why if it had spilled and was gathered up that it does not require washing. The reason is, that the only blood that requires washing is blood that had kabbalah in a kli shareis and is fit for zrika.

RA'UY L'HAZA'AH

- This comes to exclude a case where blood that is less than the amount needed for zrika was put into one keili and a similar amount of blood was put into another keili. If these are later combined into one keili it would not require washing, because this blood is not valid.
 - We see this in a Braisa regarding chatas waters, in which **R' Chalافتa bar Shaul** said, if the Kohen was mekadash less than the amount needed in one keili and a similar amount in another keili, they do not become kadosh. They then asked, does this concept apply to blood of a korbon as well? Do we say that regarding chatas water it is a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai and we therefore can't learn from it to the case of blood, or do we say that we learn it there from the pasuk of "v'taval bamayim", and since by blood it says "v'taval...badam" we learn the same concept for blood as well? They answered, that **R' Zrika in the name of R' Elazar** said that even in the case of blood it would not become kadosh.
 - **Rava** brings a Braisa which explicitly says this as well, that the entire required amount of blood must be received into one keili.
 - This Braisa also says that the pasuk of "min hadam" teaches that the blood applications on the inside Mizbe'ach must be done with the blood that is discussed in that parsha. **Rava** explains, this comes to exclude the using of leftover blood on the Kohen's finger that was there from the previous application. This supports **R' Elazar**, who says that the blood from one sprinkling that is left on the finger of the Kohen cannot be used for the next sprinkling (rather, he must again dip his finger into the blood for each sprinkling).
 - **Q: Ravin bar R' Ada** said to **Rava**, your talmid said in the name of **R' Amram** that a Braisa says that if the blood from the Kohen's finger went onto a garment the halacha is as follows: if he had not yet sprinkled it, the garment requires washing. If he had, it does not require washing. Presumably, this means that if he had not yet finished all the required sprinklings (all 7) it would require washing. This shows that the blood left on the finger is valid for all of the sprinklings!? **A:** The Braisa means that if a sprinkling was not yet done after he dipped his finger into the blood, the garment requires washing. However, if he

did one sprinkling since the dipping, it would not require washing even if he still has to do more sprinklings. This is because each sprinkling requires him to again dip his finger into the blood in the keili.

- **Q: Abaye** asked, a Mishna says that after the Kohen finishes sprinkling the blood of the parah adumah he wipes off the blood from his hand onto the body of the cow. This suggests that this is only done after all of the sprinklings, not after each of the sprinklings, which shows that the blood left after one sprinkling may be used for the next!? **A: Rava** answered, the Mishna means that after all the sprinklings he wipes his *hand*, but in between each sprinkling he only wipes his *finger*, not his entire hand.
 - **Q:** If, between sprinklings, he wipes his finger on the cow, his finger will be dirty and not fit for doing the Avodah!? **A: Abaye** said, he wipes it on the edge of the bowl.

MISHNA

- If the blood splattered onto the skins of an animal, the halacha is as follows: **R' Yehuda** says, if it was not yet skinned from the animal it would not be required to be washed, but if it was already skinned from the animal it would be required to be washed. **R' Elazar** says, even if it was skinned from the animal it would not be required to be washed.
- The only thing that must be washed is the place where the blood is (not the entire garment), and only something that can become tamei, and only something that can be washed. A cloth garment, sackcloth, and animal skins all require a washing. The washing must be done inside the Azarah. The breaking of an earthenware keili in which a korban was cooked must also be broken in the Azarah. The purging and rinsing of a copper keili in which a korban was cooked must also be done in the Azarah.
- This requirement that the blood of a chatas must be washed from a garment is a chumra that chatas has over other kodshei kodashim.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that the washing requirement applies to materials other than cloth garments? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk says “begeg”. We would think to limit this requirement to a cloth garment. The pasuk therefore says “asher yizeh aleha tichabeis”, which teaches to include animal skins after they have been skinned from the animal. We would think to even include skins that were not yet skinned from the animal. The pasuk therefore says “begeg”, which teaches that only something that *is fit* to become tamei is included in this requirement. This is the view of **R' Yehuda**. **R' Elazar** says, “begeg” would seem to limit it to cloth garments. The pasuk of “asher aleha...tichabeis” teaches to include even other materials. We would think to include skins after they have been skinned from the animal. The pasuk therefore says “begeg”, which teaches that only something that *can become* tamei is included in this requirement.
 - **Q:** What is the point of difference between them? **Abaye** said, the machlokes would be regarding a cloth that is less than 3x3 etzba'os. According to **R' Yehuda**, since this is *fit* to become tamei (if he intends to use it in a garment) this would be included. According to **R' Elazar** it would not be included, because right now it cannot become tamei. **Rava** said, the difference would be regarding a full sized garment that one intends to embroider (so it is not yet a completed garment). According to **R' Yehuda**, since this is *fit* to become tamei (if he decides not to embroider) this would be included. According to **R' Elazar** it would not be included, because right now it cannot become tamei. **Some** say that **Rava** said the difference would be regarding a cloth that was used for sitting on, which one decided to trim (it can be used for this purpose even without trimming it). According to **R' Yehuda**, since this is *fit* to become tamei (if he decides not to trim) this would be included. According to **R' Elazar** it would not be included, because right now it cannot become tamei.