

9 Sivan 5778
May 23, 2018



Zevachim Daf 40

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

The Source for All of the Sprinkling

The *braisa* had stated: I know this only regarding the seven applications (*on the Paroches*), which are indispensable in all cases.

The *Gemora* asks: Where do we see this law stated?

Rav Pappa answers: We see this law stated by the sprinklings of the sacrifice brought by a *metzora* and those of the red heifer.

(*The braisa continues*): How do we know this regarding the four applications (*of the Inner Altar*)? It is from the verse: *So shall he do*.

The *Gemora* asks: Why is this law clear regarding sacrifices with seven sprinklings? This is because the verse states this and reinforces it. [*Rashi explains that not only is the verse explicit in its requirement, it also states and he will do as he did before.*] Isn't this also stated regarding sacrifices where four sprinklings must be done on the inner Altar?

Rabbi Yirmiyah says: This is only required for Rabbi Shimon (*who holds that only two sprinklings are said explicitly regarding sacrifices that are sprinkled on the inner Altar, and the other two are only derived through a comparison*). The *braisa* states: Regarding the bull of

the anointed *Kohen* the verse states *karnos* (*plural, meaning two horns*) indicating two, and regarding the communal-error bull it also states *karnos* (*teaching us to compare them to each other, and derive that all four sprinklings are necessary*). Rabbi Yehudah says: This (*comparison*) is unnecessary. The verse states regarding both of these sacrifices that they must be done, *on the corners of the Altar...in the Ohel Moed* (*Tent of Meeting*). The extra words *Ohel Moed* indicate to us that sprinkling must be done on all corners of the Altar for any sacrifice offered in the *Ohel Moed*.

The *Gemora* asks: What does Rabbi Yehudah do with the verse (*used to teach this in the braisa*), so it should be done?

The *Gemora* answers: He requires it for the teaching mentioned in the following *braisa*. The *braisa* states: How do we know that the bull brought on *Yom Kippur* requires *semichah* and the pouring of the remainder of its blood by the base of the Altar? The verse states: *So it should be done*.

The *Gemora* asks: Would we have not known this regarding the bull of *Yom Kippur* without this teaching? Didn't we derive that *l'par* (*stated by the bull of the anointed Kohen*) refers to the bull of *Yom Kippur*? [*This teaches that we compare the two. We can therefore derive through this comparison that the bull of Yom*

Kippur should require semichah etc. as it is like the bull of the anointed Kohen, where this is done.]

The Gemora answers: This teaching is required. One might think that the comparison between the bull of the anointed Kohen and the bull of Yom Kippur is only regarding parts of the service that are essential to the atonement. However, we would not compare them regarding *semichah* etc. This is why we require the teaching from *so it should be done*.

The Gemora asks: What does Rabbi Shimon do with the verse *in the Tent of Meeting*?

The Gemora answers: He understands this teaches us that if the roof of the *Heichal* was breached, one could not sprinkle the blood.

The Gemora asks: How does Rabbi Yehudah know this law?

The Gemora answers: He derives this from the verse *that*, as opposed to Rabbi Shimon who does not derive anything from the word *that*.

Abaye says: Rabbi Yehudah also requires the verse, *so it should be*. One might think that these sprinklings should be like *semichah* and the pouring of the remaining blood. Although the verse stated them twice, if one omits them, they do not invalidate the sacrifice. Perhaps all four sprinklings as well do not invalidate the sacrifice? This is why the verse states: *So it should be done*.

The *braisa* stated: *L'par* refers to the bull of Yom Kippur.

The Gemora asks: Why is this stated? If it is to teach that all four sprinklings must be done, this is obvious, as the verse states, *chukah* (*it is a law*)!?

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak answers: This is required according to Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Yehudah understands that *chukah* is only stated regarding a service that is done with the “white clothes” (*as opposed to the standard priestly vestments of the Kohen Gadol*) in the Holy of Holies. If he did these services out of order on Yom Kippur, they would be invalid. However, services done out of order outside of the Holy of Holies would be valid. We therefore might think that just as these services do not have to be in order (*as chukah is not referring to the order of services outside the Holy of Holies*), so too the verse *chukah* does not teach us that all of the sprinklings must be done. This is why the verse states *l'par*.

Rav Pappa asks: Is it possible to say that Rabbi Yehudah indeed derives that all of the sprinklings must be done from *l'par*? The *braisa* states: *And he will complete from atoning for the Holy*. This teaches that if he atoned (*did the regular sprinklings*) he completed (*i.e. the sacrifice is valid, even if he did not pour the remaining blood on the base of the Altar*). If he did not atone, he did not finish (*and the sacrifice is invalid*). These are the words of Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Yehudah asked him: Why don't we say that if he completed (*and even poured the blood*) he atoned, but if he did not finish he does not atone? [*This implies that Rabbi Yehudah's source that all of the sprinklings must be done is this verse, not l'par!*]

Rav Pappa answers: The comparison from *l'par* (*that teaches us to compare the bull of Yom Kippur to the communal-error bull and by extension to bull of the*

anointed Kohen, see Rashi) teaches us the laws derived from the words *es*, *b'dam*, and *v'taval* mentioned regarding the bull of the anointed Kohen.

Rav Acha bar Yakov says: *Es* (*etzba'o*) teaches us that if a Kohen has a growth on his finger, it is not considered a *chatzitzah* (*interposition*) between his finger and the blood. *B'dam* teaches that the amount of blood accepted in the vessel must be enough for the Kohen to dip his finger into the blood (*as opposed to blood being gathered in separate vessels and being combined later to form this amount*). *V'taval* teaches that he must dip his finger into the blood to get it, as opposed to wiping it off the side of the vessel.

The *Gemora* explains: The teaching of *b'dam* was necessary. If it would just say *v'taval*, I would think that this is regardless of whether or not the amount of blood originally accepted was an amount fit for dipping. This is why the Torah wrote *b'dam*. If it would only say *b'dam*, one might think that this is even if he wipes it off the sides of the vessel. This is why the Torah says *v'taval*.

[The *Gemora* earlier made a derivation from the extra words *in the Tent of Meeting*. In this same verse there are the similarly extra words *the Altar of the ketores samim* (*incense*).] The *Gemora* asks: What do the extra words *the Altar of the incense* teach us?

The *Gemora* answers: This teaches us that if there was a new Altar that had not yet been inaugurated with the bringing of incense on it, he would not sprinkle the blood of a communal-error bull on it.

The *Gemora* quotes a *braisa* supporting Rav Pappa's position (*that through l'par we derive that the laws of es, b'dam and v'taval apply to the bull of Yom Kippur*). The *braisa* states: *And he will do...as he did*. Why does the verse have to say *l'par* (*as this is obvious*)? This teaches us to include the bull of *Yom Kippur* for everything said regarding this topic (*i.e. es, b'dam, v'taval*). Rabbi Yishmael says: This is a *kal vachomer*. If in a situation where the types of sacrifices are not similar, we see that the laws of these sacrifices are similar, certainly when they types of sacrifices are similar we should compare their service to each other! Why, then, does it say *l'par*? It must be including the communal-error bull. The second *l'par* must be including the bull of the anointed Kohen.

Rabbi Yishmael stated: If in a situation where the types of sacrifices are not similar etc.

The *Gemora* asks: What does this mean? If Rabbi Yishmael is referring to the bull of *Yom Kippur* and the goat of *Yom Kippur* (*which are different animals*), one can ask that in those cases it is understandable that we compare them, as their blood is brought inside the *Heichal*. Rather, he must be talking about the communal-error bull and the goat brought for idolatry. However, this cannot be, as these sacrifices are brought for sins that are clear, which is why it is understandable that their service is similar!?

Rather, the *Gemora* concludes: He must be referring to the communal-error bull and the goat brought for idolatry. The *kal vachomer* is as follows. If a bull and goat, which are two different animals, have the same laws regarding service, certainly the bull of *Yom Kippur* and the bull of the anointed Kohen (*and by extension the*

communal-error bull) which are both bulls should have the same laws! (40a – 41a)

DAILY MASHAL

Sanctuary Breach

One of the things the Greek government did to undermine our religious life was to enter the Sanctuary and break through [its structure] (Rambam, Hilchos Chanukah 3:1). This may have been a symbolic way of destroying Jewish life, but if it is mentioned as one of the things done by the Greeks, and specified as being the Sanctuary that was punctured rather than the Temple building (in general), it would seem that there was more than just symbolism to this act. The *Mishna* in Midos (2:3) mentions that they broke through the Serug, the fence on the Temple Mount that marked where non-Jews couldn't go. The Vilna Gaon explains that the Greeks broke through this fence specifically to show that these boundaries were no longer valid, and Rav Yitzchok Sorotzkin, shlita (Gevuras Yitzchok, Chanukah 21) suggests that the Greeks also had a reason to specifically break through the Sanctuary's structure.

Our *Gemora* says that if part of the ceiling of the Sanctuary was breached, they could not sprinkle the blood in the Sanctuary, as without a complete ceiling it is no longer a tent, and no longer qualifies as the *Ohel Moed* (Tent of Meeting). Most of the Temple service can still be performed, as a building isn't needed if done on the location where the Temple belongs. This sprinkling, however, which the Torah (e.g. Vayikra 4:7) specifies as having to be done in the *Ohel Moed*, can't be done if it's not a structure.

Rav Sorotzkin points out that when the Torah discusses the lighting of the menorah (Shemos 27:21 and Vayikra 24:3), it specifies that it is in the *Ohel Moed*, and wonders whether this means that, like the sprinkling of the blood, the Sanctuary has to be a tent (i.e. without holes in the ceiling) in order to fulfill the *mitzvah* of lighting the *menorah*. If it does (he continues), this would explain why the Greeks made holes in the ceiling of the Sanctuary. Just as they purposely contaminated all of the oil (*which might be why the Kohen Gadol sealed some jars, to verify that it had not been tampered with*) in order to prevent the Jews from lighting the *menorah* (see Bach towards the end of OC 670), they tried to make the Sanctuary unfit for the *menorah* as well. This, Rav Sorotzkin explains, could be why the expression in Your holy courtyards is used, as due to the holes in the ceiling (*which they didn't have a chance to repair yet*), the Sanctuary didn't really qualify as the Sanctuary, but was *halachically* considered a courtyard.