

6 Sivan 5778
May 20, 2018



Zevachim Daf 37

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Blood Applications

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: How is it known that if one made one application in the case of the bloods which are to be sprinkled on the outer Altar, he has made atonement? It is from the verse: *And the blood of your sacrifices shall be poured out.* [It seems that even one pouring would suffice.]

The *Gemora* asks: Now, is this verse required for that purpose? Surely it is needed for that which was taught in the following *braisa*: How is it known that all blood (*remaining in the cup, after the sprinkling*) must be poured out at the base of the Altar? It is from the verse: *And the blood of your sacrifices shall be poured out.*?

The *Gemora* answers: He derives that (*regarding the remaining blood*) from Rebbe’s inference, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rebbe said: *And the remainder of the blood (from a chatas bird) shall be drained out (at the base of the Altar).* Now, “*of the blood*” is not necessary to be stated; why then is it stated? It is because we have learned only that that blood which requires four applications (*its remainder*) must be poured out at the base; from where do we know that this law applies by other blood as well? It is from the verse: *And the remainder of the blood (from a chatas bird) shall be drained out (at the base of the Altar).*

The *Gemora* asks: Yet still, does the verse come for this purpose? It is required for that which was taught in the following *braisa*: How do we know that if the *Kohen* poured out the blood (*when he was close to the Altar*) which should have been sprinkled (*from afar*) that he has nevertheless

fulfilled his obligation? It is from the verse: *And the blood of your sacrifices shall be poured out.*

The *Gemora* answers: He holds as Rabbi Akiva who maintains that sprinkling is not included in pouring, and pouring is not included in sprinkling, for it was taught in a *Mishna*: If he recited the blessing for the *pesach* offering (*lechol es ha’pesach*), he thereby exempts the (*chagigah*) sacrifice (*that comes with it*); but if he recited the blessing for the sacrifice (*lechol es ha’zevach*), he does not exempt the *pesach* offering; these are the words of Rabbi Yishmael. Rabbi Akiva said: The *pesach* offering does not exempt the sacrifice, nor does the sacrifice exempt the *pesach* offering. [The *Gemora* in *Pesachim* explains that in Rabbi Yishmael’s opinion sprinkling (*zerikah*) is included in pouring (*shefichah*), but pouring is not included in sprinkling; whereas Rabbi Akiva holds that neither is included in the other. Both Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Akiva hold that the blood of the *pesach* offering must be poured out, i.e., the *Kohen* should stand near the Altar and pour the blood. But the blood of the *chagigah* offering requires sprinkling, i.e., from a distance and with some force. Now Rabbi Yishmael holds that if the *chagigah* is poured out instead of sprinkled, the obligation of sprinkling has nevertheless been discharged. Consequently, the blessing for the *pesach* offering includes that of the *chagigah* offering, since in both the blood may be poured. But if the blood of the *pesach* offering is sprinkled, the obligation has not been discharged; consequently the blessing for the *chagigah* offering, whose blood is normally sprinkled, does not exempt the *pesach* offering. Following the same logic, we infer that in Rabbi Akiva’s view is that neither includes the other.]

The *Gemora* asks: Yet still, does the verse come for this purpose? It is required for that which was taught in the following *braisa*: Rabbi Yishmael said: Since it is written: *And the firstborn of an ox, or the firstborn of a sheep, or the firstborn of a goat [their blood shall be sprinkled on the Altar, and their fats shall be burned]*. We learn from this that a *bechor* requires blood application and its sacrificial parts are burned on the Altar. From where do we know (*that the same applies*) regarding *ma'aser* and the *pesach* offering? It is because it is written: *And the blood of your sacrifices shall be poured out.*?

The *Gemora* answers: He holds as Rabbi Yosi HaGelili, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Yosi HaGelili said: It does not say, *"its blood,"* but rather, *"their blood"* is said; and *"its fat"* is not said, but rather, *"their fat"* is said. This teaches us that *bechor*, *ma'aser* and the *pesach* offering require blood application and its sacrificial parts are burned on the Altar.

The *Gemora* asks: And Rabbi Yishmael uses the verse for two purposes!?

The *Gemora* answers: There is a *Tannaic* dispute as to what he truly holds.

The *Gemora* asks: Now, as for Rabbi Yishmael, who understands the entire verse to be referring only to *bechor*, it is well; for that is why it is written: *And their meat (three different types of animals) shall be to you (the Kohanim)*. But according to Rabbi Yosi HaGelili, who understands the entire verse to be referring to *ma'aser* and the *pesach* offering too, surely they are eaten by their owners (*and not the Kohanim*); so what then is the meaning of the verse: *And their meat shall be to you (the Kohanim)*?

The *Gemora* answers: The plural form teaches us regarding two types of firstborns: one that is complete and one which is blemished; and thus intimating that a blemished *bechor* is given to a *Kohen*, for which teaching, we do not find any other verse in the entire Torah!

The *Gemora* notes that Rabbi Yishmael derives this from the end of the verse, which states: *it shall be yours*.

The *Gemora* asks: Now, as for Rabbi Yosi HaGelili, who understands the verse to be referring to *ma'aser* and the *pesach* offering, it is well, for that is why it is written: *You shall not redeem them, for they are holy*, for this teaches us that they are offered as a *korban* but not their exchange (*the temurah of those korbanos*), for it was taught in a *Mishna*: The *temurah* (*the owner attempts to exchange a different animal with the original korban; the halacha is that the temurah animal gets the same sanctity as the original one*) of a *bechor* or *ma'aser* - they themselves, their offspring, and the offspring of their offspring until the end of time - have the same laws as the *bechor* or *ma'aser* (*respectively*), and they are eaten, when blemished, by their owners (and not sold in the market). And we learned in a *Mishna*: Rabbi Yehoshua said: I have heard that the *temurah* of a *pesach* offering is offered, and that the *temurah* of a *pesach* offering is not offered, and I cannot explain it. [*It emerges, however, that there is one temurah that is offered; the Gemora elsewhere explains it to be referring to a case where the temurah was made after Pesach, and therefore it is offered as a shelamim.*] However, according to Rabbi Yishmael, who understands the entire verse to be referring only to *bechor*, from where does he know that the *temurah* of the *ma'aser* and the *pesach* offering are not offered?

The *Gemora* answers: As for *ma'aser*, he derives it through a *gezeirah shavah* from *bechor*; and as for a *pesach* offering, *"it is"* is written by it - teaching us that the *pesach* offering is offered on the altar, but not its *temurah* (*when it was made before Pesach*).

The *Gemora* asks: And as for all these *Tannaim* who utilize the verse of *"And the blood of your sacrifices shall be poured out"* for a different exposition, how do they know that if one made one application in the case of the bloods which are to be sprinkled on the outer Altar, he has made atonement?



The *Gemora* answers: They hold as Beis Hillel, who maintains that even by a *chatas*, which only had one application, nevertheless there is atonement; he therefore derives all other offerings from the law of *chatas*.

Rav Huna said: What is Beis Shammai's reason for their opinion (*that two applications provide atonement by a chatas, but one will not*)? It is that the plural "*karnos*" (*horns of the Altar*) is written three times in this context denoting six. They understand as follows: four "*karnos*" indicate the prescribed procedure, and the other two teach us that two applications are indispensable. [Evidently, Beis Shammai holds that the way a word is pronounced is determinant in Biblical exposition, and therefore each of the words can be expounded in the plural form even though two of them are written without a "*vav*."] But Beis Hillel say that since "*karnos*" is twice written without the "*vav*", only four applications are implied. Three of them indicate the prescribed procedure, and the last one teaches us that one application is indispensable.

The *Gemora* asks: But why not argue that all the four are for the prescribed procedure (*and the sacrifice will be valid even without any applications*)?

The *Gemora* answers: We do not find atonement effected without anything. (36b – 37b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

"Eim" or "Av"?

The *Gemora* in Sanhedrin cites the opinion of Beis Shammai (*and others*) that hold that the way a word is pronounced is determinant in Biblical exposition (*yeish eim lamikra*).

The Rif was questioned as to why the *Gemora* uses the word *eim*, which means mother, and not *av*, which means father. A similar question would be that the *Gemora* refers to one of

the thirteen principles of Biblical hermeneutics as a *binyan av* and not a *binyan eim*.

The Rif initially responded that he never heard anyone shed light on this matter, but then he proceeded to offer a possible explanation. When the purpose of a principle is to teach a concept in a different area, the *Gemora* uses the term *av*, whereas if the discussion at hand is regarding relying on a principle, the *Gemora* uses the word *eim*.

Shearim Mitzuyanim B'Halacha explains the words of the Rif. The mother is the *akeres habayis*, the mainstay of the house as it is said *every honorable princess dwelling within*. For this reason we say *yeish eim lemikra* or *yeish eim lemasores*, as the mother is the central figure in the house and it is the mother who everyone is dependent upon. The father, on the other hand, is not usually found in the house, as he leaves the house to seek a livelihood. The principle of a *binyan av*, however, is that we are building from one location to another, and this is analogous to a father who influences others. (See *Rabbeinu Bachye to Devarim 33:8* for further discussion on the differences between the father and mother.)

HALACHAH ON THE DAF

The Parshios of Tefillin

Letotafos (*tefillin placed on the head*) occurs three times in the Torah, twice without a "*vav*" and once without a "*vav*," - four in all. This teaches us that four compartments are to be inserted in the (*head*) *tefillin*. This is the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael. Rabbi Akiva, however, maintains that there is no need for that explanation, for the word *totafos* itself implies four, since it is composed of the word *tot* which means two in Caspi, and *fos* which means two in Afriki.

In both the *shel rosh* (*head tefillin*) and *shel yad* (*arm tefillin*), there are the same four passages written in them; the only difference between them is that in the *shel rosh* each *bayis* (*compartment*) contains one passage, while in the *shel yad* all



four passages are written in the same *bayis* on one piece of parchment. (Orach Chaim 32:2). Furthermore, these four passages must be written in order as it appears in the Torah which is *Kadesh, V'hayah ki yi'vi'achah, She'ma, V'hayah im shamo'a*, and if they aren't, the *tefillin* are invalid. (ibid 32:1).

There is a well known disagreement between Rashi and Rabbeinu Tam as to what is the correct order of the passages: Rashi holds that it is *Kadesh, V'hayah ki yi'vi'achah, She'ma, V'hayah im shamo'a*, starting from left to right. Rabbeinu Tam maintains that *V'hayah im shamo'a* goes before *She'ma*. The Shulchan Aruch rules in accordance with Rashi (ibid. 34:1). The Mishnah Berurah points out that Rabbeinu Tam is not arguing on the order that it must be written, rather, only on the order that it needs to be placed in the compartments.

The Bach quotes the S'mag and Mordechai, who reported that a pair of *tefillin* were found in the grave of Yechezkel Hanavi, and the passages appeared in the order of Rashi. Some do not consider this as proof that the ancient *tefillin* were in fact made according to the opinion of Rashi, since it might have been buried precisely because it was out of order. The Bach rejects this answer, since they could have simply switched it back to the proper order, as we learned that it is only the placing out of order in the compartments that invalidates the *tefillin*.

DAILY MASHAL

The Disagreement of the Translations

It is interesting that the disagreement of Beis Shami and Beis Hillel, if *karnos* ("horns") is singular or plural, is expressed in the traditional translations to Aramaic. Targum Onkelos and Targum Yonasan ben Uziel translate this word (Vayikra 2:25, 30, 33) *karnas*, in the singular, according to Beis Hillel, whereas the Targum Yerushalmi translates it in the plural, *karneseih*, according to Beis Shamai. Indeed, in many places the Targum Yerushalmi translates according to Beis Shamai,

not because it agrees with Beis Shamai but on the contrary, because Beis Shamai agrees with the Targum Yerushalmi. Many claim that the Targumim stem from the era of Ezra and the Keneses HaGedolah, a long time before Beis Shamai and Beis Hillel! (*Torah Sheleimah*, XXV, 342).