

13 Iyar 5778
April 28, 2018



Zevachim Daf 15

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

Rectifying Mistakes

It was stated: Ulla said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan:
Carrying not by foot is not called carrying.

The *Gemora* asks: Can such a carrying be corrected, or perhaps it is not possible to rectify it?

The *Gemora* answers from the following *Mishna*: If a qualified *Kohen* received the blood and passed it to an unqualified person, the latter must return it to the qualified one. And even if we will say this means that the qualified person should continue and receive the blood, it nevertheless indicates that it is possible that the sacrifice will still be considered valid, as otherwise it should be rendered invalid (*due to an invalid person having been involved in the carrying*)!

The *Gemora* rejects this proof by saying that the case is not where the non-*Kohen* is close to the Altar, but rather far away from the Altar. [*In other words, the qualified Kohen took the blood away from the Altar and gave it to the invalid person. This is not called carrying at all, and is why it can be rectified. (However, it is still possible that if an invalid person did actual carrying, it would render the sacrifice invalid.)*]

It was taught that Ulla said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: If someone does carrying not by foot, it is invalid. This indicates that in such a case it cannot be rectified.

Rav Nachman asked Ulla a question on this from the following *Mishna*: If the blood spilled from the vessel, and

the *Kohen* gathered it, the sacrifice remains valid. [*This implies that it can be rectified!*]

The *Gemora* answers: The case is where the blood spilled away from the Altar (*and therefore, there was no improper carrying towards the Altar*).

The *Gemora* asks: Is it possible that the blood only went away from the Altar?

The *Gemora* answers: It was in a place where there was a slight slope in the floor (*so it indeed only flowed in one direction*). Alternatively, it fell into a hole in the floor (*and therefore did not spread towards the Altar*). Alternatively, it was thick blood (*and therefore did not spread much at all*).

The *Gemora* asks: Did the *Mishna* take pains in order to tell us the law in these cases? Additionally, the *Mishna* below says that if the blood fell on the floor and he gathered it, it is invalid. Accordingly, we should have made a distinction in the previous *Mishna* (*where it is valid if it spilled from a vessel*) that it is only valid if it spilled away from the Altar, not if it spilled towards the Altar! [*The fact that no difference is made indicates that it is always invalid if the blood spills from the neck of the animal onto the floor, and it is always valid if it spills from the vessel onto the floor.*] This is indeed a refutation of Ulla.

It was taught that if a person does carrying not by foot, there is an argument between Rabbi Shimon (*who says it is invalid*) and the Rabbis.



The *Gemora* concludes: Everyone agrees by a long carrying (*with the blood to the Altar, for it was slaughtered away from the Altar*), it is invalid (*if he had an improper intention at that time*). The argument is only by a short carrying (*when the animal is slaughtered close to the Altar that the Kohen merely stretches out his hand and sprinkles the blood without walking at all*).

They mocked this statement in *Eretz Yisroel*. How will it be possible that a bird *chatas* will be rendered invalid through an improper intention according to Rabbi Shimon? If he has an improper thought before the blood comes out (*from its neck*), this is nothing at all (*as he did not move*)! If it was after the blood sprayed from the neck, the *mitzvah* has already been completed!?

The *Gemora* asks: What is the question? Perhaps the improper thought could be between the time that the blood squirts out and when it reaches the Altar?

This is as Rabbi Yirmiyah asked Rabbi Zeira: If a person was sprinkling blood, and his hand got cut off before the blood actually reaching the airspace of the Altar, what is the law? [*Is this considered blood sprinkled by a Kohen with a blemish, which is invalid?*]

Rabbi Zeira replied: The sprinkling is invalid, as the verse states: *And he will sprinkle...and he will place (indicating that the sprinkling is considered to occur until the blood actually reaches the Altar)*.

When Rav Papa and Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua came from the study hall, they explained the “mocking.” Can it be that they do not argue about a long carrying? But that is precisely where they argue in the *Mishna*!?! Rather, everyone agrees that a short carrying will not be disqualified with an improper thought. Their argument is in a case where there was a long carrying.

In a case where a non-*Kohen* carried the blood to the Altar, and then a *Kohen* took it back and carried it again, there is an argument between the sons of Rabbi Chiya and Rabbi Yannai. One says that it is valid, while one says that it is invalid. Their argument is regarding whether or not the carrying of the non-*Kohen* is rectifiable.

If a *Kohen* carried it and then returned it, and then a non-*Kohen* carried it to the Altar, Rav Simi bar Ashi says that according to the one who said it is valid in the previous case, this case is invalid, and according to the one who said it is invalid in the previous case, this case is valid. Rava says: Everyone agrees that in this case it is invalid. Why? This is because the blood had to be taken back to the Altar (*after the Kohen took it away, and therefore the non-Kohen did a significant carrying*).

Rabbi Yirmiyah said to Rav Ashi: Rav Yirmiyah from Difti made the following statement: This logic “that the blood had to be taken” is the subject of an argument between Rabbi Eliezer and the Rabbis, for the *Mishna* states: Rabbi Eliezer said: If one goes where he needs to go, a wrong intention disqualifies it; however, where he does not need to go, a wrong intention does not disqualify it. And Rava said: Everyone agrees that if he accepted the blood far away from the Altar and brought it close, he needed to do that walking. If he was close and brought it further away, he did not need to do it. Their argument is regarding when he brought it close to the Altar, and then took it out. One opinion is that he now must bring it back (*and therefore if he had an improper thought during this carrying, it renders the sacrifice invalid*). The other opinion says that this is not considered carrying required for the service of the sacrifice (*as he did not have to take it away*).

Abaye asks from the following *braisa*: Rabbi Eliezer says that if someone is walking where he needs to do so, an improper thought can render the sacrifice invalid. What is the case? If he accepted the blood far away from the Altar and brought it close, he needed to do that walking. If he was close and



brought it further away, he did not need to do it. We may infer from here that bringing it back a second time is necessary!?

Rava answered: If this is what the *braisa* states (*that Rabbi Eliezer agrees to this*), it must be correct. [*Rashi explains that Rabbi Eliezer only argues on his father, Rabbi Shimon, not the Tanna Kamma.*] (15a – 15b)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, KOL HAZEVACHIM

Mishna

All sacrifices whose blood was received by a non-Kohen, an *onein* (one whose close relative passed away and has not been buried yet), a *tevil yom* (one who was *tamei*, but has immersed himself in a mikvah; he is considered a *tevil yom* until nightfall), a *mechusar kippurim* (one who was *tamei*, but has immersed himself in a mikvah, and has waited until nightfall; he is just lacking atonement until he brings his offerings the next day), one who lacked the priestly vestments, one who did not wash his hands or feet, one who is uncircumcised, one who is *tamei*, someone who is sitting, someone who either is standing on vessels, an animal, or the feet of his friend, the sacrifice is invalid. If he received the blood with his left hand, it is invalid. Rabbi Shimon says it is valid. (15b)

Non-Kohen Disqualifying the Korban

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know that a non-Kohen cannot receive the blood?

Levi explains that this is as the verse states: *Speak to Aaron and his sons saying that they should separate themselves from the holies of the Children of Israel.* What do the words *Children of Israel* exclude? If they exclude women, does this mean that a woman's *korban* can be brought in *tumah*? Rather, this excludes the sacrifice of idolaters.

The *Gemora* asks: This cannot be! The *tzitz* does not effect acceptance for such sacrifices, as the master said that for the sacrifices of idolaters, whether they offered the *tamei* blood inadvertently or intentionally, it does not effect acceptance; certainly we would not allow it to be offered by a *Kohen* who is *tamei*!?

Rather, the verse should be understood as follows: *they should separate themselves from the holies* -that the *Kohanim* who are *tamei* should not perform the services on any sacrifices. *The Children of Israel and they shall not profane* is teaching that a non-Kohen should not offer any sacrifices. (15b)

DAILY MASHAL

Kohanim have Four Functions

HaGaon Rav Chayim Kanievski points out that **all** the *Kohanim's* functions are mentioned in the verse "and the *kohanim*, the sons of Levi, will approach for Hashem...has chosen them **to serve Him and bless in the name of Hashem and according to their pronouncement will be every judgment and every affliction**" (Devarim 21:5): service in the Temple, *birkas kohanim*, every judgment – *kohanim* should participate in the Sanhedrin (Rambam, *Hilchos Sanhedrin*, 2:2), and every affliction – examining *nega'im*. The order is not accidental. Those with physical defects are disqualified from serving in the Temple; sitting is forbidden when serving and during *birkas kohanim*. A minor is disqualified for both functions and for the Sanhedrin but the examination of *nega'im* may be performed by all *kohanim*, even minors.