



The Blood of a Chatat in the Heichal

The *Torah* teaches that if one brings the *dam* (blood) of a *chatat* offering into the *heichal* (that is not offered there) it is invalid. The *Mishnah* (8:12) presents three opinions regarding the point at which the blood becomes invalid. *R' Eliezer* maintains that it is as soon as it enters. *R' Shimon* argues that it is not invalid until the *dam* is placed in there. *R' Yehuda* however explains that if the blood was brought in *be'shogeg* then it is not invalid. We shall try to understand the position of *R' Yehuda*.

The *Gemara* asks, does *R' Yehuda* invalidate the *korban* if it was deliberately brought inside or only if it was offered? Ostensibly, it appears to be asking whether he is commenting on the position of *R' Eliezer* or *R' Shimon*. The conclusion is that he agrees with *R' Shimon* insofar as that if placed the blood deliberately then the blood is *pasul*.

But how do we define *be'shogeg* in this case? There are a number of possibilities and they are found in a comment of the *Sefat Emet*. On the day *Nadav* and *Avihu* died, *Aharon* offered the *korban* for *Rosh Chodesh* – a *Chatat* offering. Instead of eating from the parts that are usually eaten by the *kohanim*, *Aharon* burnt them. *Moshe* questioned *Aharon* saying, “Behold, its blood was not brought into the Sanctuary within; you should have eaten it in the Holy as I commanded.” Since it was the day that *Aharon's* son's had died he was defined as an *onen*. *Aharon* answered that even though a *kohen* (by exception) is allowed to perform *avodah* when he is an *onen*, he is not allowed to eat from the *korbanot*.

The *Sefat Emet* (*Zevachim* 82b) notes that the *halacha* is like *R' Yehuda* and according to the simple reading of the *Gemara* the *dam* is only invalid if it was brought inside and offered against *halacha* deliberately (*be'meizid*). How could *Moshe* suspect *Aharon* and his sons of doing so?

He answers the question by directing our attention to a doubt of the *Raavad* who was unsure of the definition of *be'shogeg* in our case. It could either be that the *kohen* mistook the blood for that of a *chatat* that is offered inside. Alternatively, it could be that the *kohen* did not know that the blood of a regular *chatat* is invalid if brought inside. The *Sefat Emet* understands that because there is a doubt, it must mean that there is a form of *shogeg* that would

invalidate the blood. Consequently, *Moshe Rabbeinu* might have suspected *Aharon* of bringing the blood of the *chatat* inside the *heichal* in the type of *shogeg* that would have invalidated the *korban*.

The *Rambam* however writes as follows:

The blood of a *chatat* that is brought inside for atonement and atonement was not achieved, rather it was brought out again and no blood was placed, if it was *be'shogeg* then it is valid... if it was deliberate then it is invalid.

This appears to contradict the *Gemara* where it is only *R' Yehuda* that differentiates between *shogeg* and *meizid* and he does so only when the blood is offered.

R' Chaim (al *Ha'Rambam Psulei Mukdashim* 2:16) explains that the issue at hand is not the *dam's* presence in the *heichal*. Rather it is, as the *pasuk* states, with bringing the blood inside when it is “*le'chaper*” – for atonement. If brought in *be'shogeg* then it would not qualify – for the intent of *le'chaper* is no longer. If however the blood was offered, then we can no longer say his original intention to achieve atonement is void. While this explains the rational, how does it explain the *Rambam's* apparent contradiction with the *Gemara*?

R' Chaim directs us to another *Gemara* (*Zevachim* 26a) that teaches, if *dam* that was meant to be offered on the outer *mizbeach* was offered on the *mizbeach* in the *heichal*, then atonement is nevertheless achieved for the owners; yet the meat cannot be consumed. This law only apply if placed on the inner *mizbeach* and not if placed before the *parochet* (curtain) or between the *badim* (poles of the *aron*). Recall that the *R' Chaim* explains that according to the *Rambam* if one entered *be'shogeg* and “*kiper*” – atonement is achieved – the issue of “*le'chaper*” still exist and the blood would be invalid. *R' Chaim* understands that this would only be the case if the blood was placed on the inner *mizbeach* but not if it was sprinkled in the other locations. Consequently, the *Rambam* was referring to when the blood was placed on the inner *mizbeach* – even *be'shogeg* would be an issue. The *Gemara* however was referring to where the blood was placed before the curtain, and only *be'meizid* would make the blood invalid.

Yisrael Yitzchak Bankier

Revision Questions

זבחים ח' ט' ז'

- What is the law regarding a mixture of blood to be sprinkled on the *mizbeach* and: (ח' ז')
- Water?
- Wine?
- Other animal blood? (ח' ז')
- Blood from a *pasul korban*?
- *Dam ha'tamtzit*? (Explain what this is.) (ח' ז')
- Blood from *korban* that had a blemish? (ח' ז')
- What are the two opinions regarding a mixture of:
 - Cups of blood? (ח' ז')
 - Blood to be sprinkled on the top half of the *mizbeach* with blood to be sprinkled on the bottom half? (ח' ז')
 - Blood that requires one sprinkling with blood that requires "four"? (Explain the ensuing debate.) (ח' ז')
- What is the law regarding a mixture of blood that was to be sprinkled on the outer altar with blood to be sprinkled on the inner altar? (ח' ז')
- Regarding the previous question, what is the law if the *kohen* went ahead a sprinkled the blood first inside then outside? (ח' ז')
- There is a debate regarding the previous question; regarding which sacrifice does everyone agree? (ח' ז')
- If blood from a *Chatat* was collected in two bowls and one was taken outside the *Azarah*, what is the status of the inner one? (ח' ז')
- If one of the bowls was taken inside the *Heichal* – what is the status of the bowl in the *Azarah* according to:
 - *R' Yosi Ha'Glili* and *Chachamim*? (ח' ז')
- What type of *pesul* does the *Tzitz* effect acceptance for? (ח' ז')
- What is the difference between the opinions of *Rabban Gamliel* and *Rabbi Yehoshua* with regards to sacrifices that must come down from the *mizbeach*? (ח' ז')
- What must be taken down from the *mizbeach*, according to *R' Shimon*, if a *zevach pasul* and *nechasim p'sulim* were offered? (ח' ז')
- What type of sacrifices that are *p'sulim* must be taken down from the *mizbeach* according to *R' Yehuda*? (ח' ז')
- Name three types of *p'sulim* that would have occurred outside the *Mikdash*? (ח' ז')
- How did the father of *R' Channinah Segan Ha'Kohanim* act with regards to the offering of *korbanot* that were *ba'lei mumim*? (ח' ז')
- Name three parts of an animal, which, if they are removed, should not be brought up on the *mizbeach*? (ח' ז')
- If sacrificial parts came off the *mizbeach* before *chatzot*, is one *chayav meilah* for their inappropriate use? (ח' ז')
- What else (besides the *mizbeach*) consecrates that which is contained in/on it? (ח' ז')
- Can a vessel which is used to hold liquid measures, consecrate a dry measure? (ח' ז')

Local Shiurim

Melbourne, Australia

Sunday -Thursday

10 minutes before *Mincha*
Mizrachi Shul
 Melbourne, Australia

Friday & Shabbat

10 minutes before *Mincha*
Beit Ha'Roeh
 Melbourne, Australia

Efrat, Israel

Shiur in English

Sunday -Thursday

Rabbi Mordechai Scharf
 9:00am
Kollel Magen Avraham
 Reemon Neighbourhood

ONLINE SHIURIM

Rabbi Chaim Brown
www.shemayisrael.com/mishna/

Rav Meir Pogrow
613.org/mishnah.html

Rabbi E. Kornfeld
Rabbi C. Brown
<http://www.dafyomi.co.il/calendars/myomi/myomi-thisweek.htm>

SHIUR ON KOL HALOSHON

Rabbi Moshe Meir Weiss
 In US dial: 718 906 6400
 Then select: 1 – 2 – 4

Next Week's Mishnayot...

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	שבת קודש
23 rd February כ"ג אדר	24 th February כ"ד אדר	25 th February כ"ה אדר	26 th February כ"ו אדר	27 th February כ"ז אדר	28 th February כ"ח אדר	1 st March כ"ט אדר
Zevachim 10:1-2	Zevachim 10:3-4	Zevachim 10:5-6	Zevachim 10:7-8	Zevachim 11:1-2	Zevachim 11:3-4	Zevachim 11:5-6

