



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Zevachim, Daf כ – Daf כו

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
vl'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf כ--20-----

- **R' Dimi** said in the name of **R' Yochanan** that **Ilfa** asked, according to the view that passing of the night does not require a new washing of the hands and feet, does the water in the kiyor itself become passul if left overnight? Do we say that since the washing done by these waters does not become "passul" with the passing of the night, so the water in the kiyor will likewise not become passul, or do we say that since the water in the kiyor is in a kli shareis it does become passul? **Ravin in the name of R' Yirmiya in the name of R' Ami in the name of R' Yochanan** said, that **Ilfa** later said that the same machlokes that exists regarding the effect of the passing of night for washing the hands and feet exists for the effects of passing of the night for the water in the kiyor. **Ravin** said, that **R' Yitzchok bar Bisna** said to **R' Yirmiya**, I have heard that **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan in the name of Ilfa** said that if the kiyor is not submerged into water overnight, it is not be used for washing the hands and feet the next day, and we asked whether this is because washing is not needed in the morning or because it is needed but the water of the kiyor became passul. **R' Yitzchok** continued, that **R' Assi** couldn't answer the question for us, but according to you we have a clear answer!?
  - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from a Mishna which says that Ben Katin made a pulley to lower the kiyor so that the water not become passul from passing of the night. Now, presumably this Mishna follows **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** (who says that passing of the night does not nullify the washing of hands and feet that was done). We see that even according to him the water in the kiyor would become passul overnight!? **A:** It may be that the Mishna only follows **Rebbi** (who says that passing of the night even nullifies the washing that was done).
    - **Q:** The earlier part of that Mishna says, the Kohen Gadol would then go to his ox, which was standing between the Ulam and the Mizbe'ach, with its head facing south and its face to the west. The Kohen would stand to the east of the ox, facing west, would lean both his hands on the ox and would say viduy for his own aveiros and those of his household. Now, we learn from a Braisa that the view that holds that the area between the Ulam and the Mizbe'ach is considered to be "tzafon" (north, which is where this had to be done) is the view of **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** (which means that the beginning of the Mishna, and therefore the later part of the Mishna, follows the view of **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon**)! **A:** This is not a proof. The Braisa says that **Rebbi** has an even more expansive definition of "tzafon" than does **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon**. Therefore, it may be that the Mishna is following the view of **Rebbi** and not of **R' Elazar**.
      - The Gemara says, the reason we felt the Mishna follows **R' Elazar** is because if it follows **Rebbi**, it should have said that this process is done even further away – where the Kohanim and Yisraelim walk – which is the furthest area of **Rebbi's** expansive definition. The fact that it didn't do that shows that it must be the view of **R' Elazar**.
        - The Gemara says, even **R' Elazar's** definition of tzafon includes an area farther than between the Ulam and the Mizbe'ach. If the Mishna follows **R' Elazar**, why didn't the Mishna give that area? You will answer, it is because they did the process closer to the Beis Hamikdash so as to prevent the Kohen Gadol from having to unnecessarily walk further than he must. Using this same logic we can say that the Mishna follows **Rebbi**, and the reason they did the process closer to the Beis Hamikdash was to prevent the Kohen Gadol from having to unnecessarily walk further than he must.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yochanan** said, if a Kohen washed his hands and feet for the “terumas hadeshen” (which was done before any avodah began, early in the morning), he does not have to rewash them after daybreak, because his washing was done at the beginning of that day’s avodah.
  - **Q:** Whose view does this follow? It can’t follow **Rebbi**, because he says that passing of the night nullifies the washing, and therefore a new washing should be needed at dawn!? It can’t be **R' Elazar**, because he says that if the Kohen continuously does avodah, a new washing is not needed even over a span of 10 days. Based on this, the reason is not as **R' Yochanan** said (“because his washing was done at the beginning of that day’s avodah”)!? **A: Abaye** said, he follows the view of **Rebbi**, and his view that passing of the night nullifies the washing is only D'Rabanan, and he holds that the small time between the crowing of the rooster (when terumas hadeshen was done) and dawn would not require a rewashing. **A2: Rava** said he follows **R' Elazar**, but **R' Yochanan** only holds like **R' Elazar** in regard to the beginning of the day’s avodah, not in regard to a washing that was done for the end of the day’s avodah.
    - **Q:** A Mishna says that when the Kohanim saw the Kohen who did the terumas hadeshen coming down the ramp of the Mizbe'ach, they would run and wash their hands and feet from the kiyor, to prepare to do the avodah. Presumably, these are the Kohanim who were busy doing avodah the entire night. Now, according to **Abaye** we can say that the Mishna follows **Rebbi**, and that is why these Kohanim now need a new washing, and since the rooster had already crowed they can now wash for the coming day. However, according to **Rava**, who said that **R' Yochanan's** halacha follows **R' Elazar**, who is the Tanna of this Mishna? It can’t be **Rebbi**, because he would say that another washing would be needed at dawn, so there would be no reason to wash then!? According to **R' Elazar**, there is no reason to wash, because the previous washing of the day before suffices!? **A:** It may be that it follows **R' Elazar**, and the Mishna is referring to new Kohanim who were not doing the avodah the night before. That is why they must now wash their hands and feet.
- **Q:** Does leaving the Azarah nullify the washing of the Kohen? Even if you say that passing of the night doesn’t nullify it, that may be because he didn’t leave the Azarah (and therefore didn’t have “hesech hadaas”), but when he leaves he does have “hesech hadaas” and therefore must wash again. Or, maybe we say that since it is in his hands to return, he does not have “hesech hadaas”? **A:** A Braisa says, if a Kohen washed his hands and feet and his hands then became tamei, he is toivel his hands and does not need to rewash them. If his hands or feet left the Azarah they remain in their state of kedusha. We see from the Braisa that leaving the Azarah does not necessitate another washing of the hands and feet.
  - The Gemara says this is no proof. There is no question when only his hands or feet leave the Azarah. The question is when his entire body left the Azarah.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, a Kohen who did not yet wash his hands and feet must do so with a kli shareis in the Azarah. If he did so with a kli shareis outside the Azarah or with a regular keili inside the Azarah or if he was toivel in water in a ditch, and he then did the avodah, the avodah is passul. Now, we can infer that the reason it is passul is because he did the washing outside the Azarah. However, had he washed inside the Azarah and then left, the avodah he then did would be valid! **A:** It may be that the case of the Braisa of “washing outside the Azarah” is discussing where the Kohen was in the Azarah but stuck his hands and feet outside the Azarah. However, this doesn’t answer the question of where his whole body left the Azarah.
  - **Q:** **R' Zvid** said to **R' Pappa**, a Braisa says, if a Kohen went beyond the Azarah walls, we make a determination – if he went out to spend time there he must be toivel when he returns. If he went for a short time he needs to wash his hands and feet. We see that leaving the Azarah requires another washing! **A: R' Pappa** said, the Braisa is talking about where he left to use the bathroom.
    - **Q:** The Braisa specifically deals with where he leaves to the bathroom, so that can’t be what the Braisa is talking about at this point!? **A:** The Braisa teaches the rule and then explains it.
  - **Q:** With regard to the parah adumah, **R' Chiya bar Yosef** says that the Kohen washes his hands and feet with a kli shareis inside the Azarah and then leaves to do the avodah. **R' Yochanan** said he may even do the washing outside the Azarah, and may even use a keili other than a kli shareis – even with a simple

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

earthenware cup used for drinking. We see according to **R' Chiya bar Yosef** that leaving does not nullify the washing! **A: R' Pappa** said, the case of parah adumah is different, because its entire procedure is done outside the Azarah, and that is why leaving does not nullify the washing.

- **Q:** If so, then why is washing from a kli shareis necessary at all? **A:** We try to have it treated as an avodah done inside the Azarah as much as possible.
- **Q:** If a Kohen washed his hands and feet and then became tamei, does he need to wash again or not? Even if you say that when he leaves the Azarah he does not have to wash when he comes back, that may be because the Kohen remains valid to do the Avodah the entire time and that is why he doesn't have hesech hadaas, but when he becomes tamei he is unfit to do the avodah and therefore maybe has hesech hadaas. Or maybe since he knows that he will soon become tahor he does not have hesech hadaas. **A:** The Braisa said, if a Kohen washed his hands and feet and his hands then became tamei, he is toivel his hands and does not need to rewash them. We see that he need not rewash his hands after becoming tamei!
  - The question was when his entire body became tamei, not when only his hands became tamei!
    - **Q:** When his whole body became tamei, since he must wait for sunset he surely has hesech hadaas!? **A:** The question would be where he became tamei right before sunset.
  - **Q:** With regard to the parah adumah, **R' Chiya bar Yosef** says that the Kohen washes his hands and feet with a kli shareis inside the Azarah and then leaves to do the avodah. **R' Yochanan** said he may even do the washing outside the Azarah, and may even use a keili other than a kli shareis – even with a simple earthenware cup used for drinking. Now, the Kohen who did the avodah of the parah adumah was purposely made tamei, he would then go to the mikvah and do the avodah before sunset. This was done because the Tzedukim would say that a tvul yom is not valid to do the avodah of the parah adumah. We purposely made him into a tvul yom to show that we don't hold like them. We see that although he became tamei, his initial washing remains effective! **A:** This is no proof. The case of parah adumah is different, as we see that even a tvul yom is valid to do its avodah.
    - **Q:** If so, then why is washing necessary at all? **A:** We try to have it treated as an avodah done inside the Azarah as much as possible.

### -----Daf נב-----21-----

- **Q:** Can the washing of the Kohen's hands and feet be done by dipping them into the water of the kiyor? Maybe since the pasuk says "mimenu", it teaches that the water must be "from it", but dipping into it would not be valid, or maybe we say that even dipping into it would be valid? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the Braisa quoted earlier said, if a Kohen dipped his hands into the water of a ditch and then did the avodah, it would be passul. This suggests that if he dipped in this fashion in the water of the kiyor it would be valid!
  - The Gemara says this is no proof. The reason the Braisa uses the case of the water in the ditch is because we would think to say that since such water can be used to toivel one's whole body, it may certainly be used to toivel one's hands in. However, the inference regarding kiyor cannot be made.
- **R' Chiya bar Yosef** said, the water of the kiyor becomes passul for the purpose of washing the hands and feet of a Kohen who will be doing the avodah for "matirin" (the part of the korbon that will permit the rest of the korbon to be offered or eaten – e.g. the zrika) in the same way that the matirin themselves become passul (just as the blood becomes passul at sundown, the water in the kiyor becomes passul at sundown to use for a Kohen who needs to wash to do the avodah of matirin). The water becomes passul for the washing for a Kohen who will be offering the limbs of a korbon in the same way that the limbs themselves become passul – at daybreak. **R' Chisda** said, that even for purposes of matirin the water only becomes passul in the way that the limbs becomes passul – at daybreak. **R' Yochanan** said, once the kiyor is lowered into the bor before sunset, it may not be taken out until after daybreak.
  - **Q:** Does this mean that **R' Yochanan** holds that the kiyor's water may not be used at night for a night avodah if it was taken out of the bor at any point of the night? We find that **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan in the name of Ilfa** said that if the kiyor was not lowered into the bor at night, it may be used for washing for the night avodos, and on the next day it is not used for washing. This contradicts what he

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

says here!? **A:** When **R' Yochanan** said "it may not be taken out until after daybreak", he means for the purposes of day avodos. However, for night avodos it would be fine.

- **Q:** If this is what **R' Yochanan** means, he is saying the same thing as **R' Chiya bar Yosef**!? **A:** The difference would be that **R' Chiya bar Yosef** holds the water becomes passul immediately at sunset, whereas **R' Yochanan** says it does not become passul until daybreak, however he requires that it be lowered into the bor at sunset as a gezeira.
  - **Q:** We find that **R' Yochanan** says that the Kohen would wash his hands and feet before doing the terumas hadeshen (which was before daybreak) and we don't find that he would require that the kiyor be lowered back into the bor after that!? Now, according to **Rava** who explained that ruling of **R' Yochanan** as following **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon**, we can answer that that is the reason it is not be lowered again, whereas our ruling of **R' Yochanan** follows **Rebbi** and that is why the kiyor must be lowered during the night. However, according to **Abaye** who says that that ruling of **R' Yochanan** was said according to **Rebbi**, why is it that here he holds that the kiyor must be in the bor all night and in the ruling regarding terumas hadeshen he allows for the kiyor to be used before daybreak? **A:** **R' Yochanan** means that after it is used by the Kohen for the terumas hadeshen, the kiyor would have to again be lowered into the bor until after daybreak.
  - **Q:** If it is mutar because it is lowered again, why did **R' Yochanan in the name of Ilfa** say that if the kiyor was raised out during the night it may not be used for washing the next day? **A:** What he meant was, that if washing was done before daybreak the Kohen does not need to wash again the next day.
  - **Q:** Does this mean that **R' Yochanan** would say that the water is even valid for a Kohen to offer matirin? If so, he is saying the same thing as **R' Chisda**!? **A:** The difference between them is that **R' Yochanan** holds there is a mitzvah to have it lowered into the bor for the whole night so that we are certain it will be that was at daybreak. **R' Chisda** does not have that concern and therefore does not require that it be lowered all night.
- A Mishna says that no one saw the Kohen who went to do the terumas hadeshen (it was still very dark) or heard him, until they heard the pulley system that Ben Katin had made for the kiyor. At that point the Kohanim would say "It has reached the time for us to wash our hands and feet from the kiyor!" Now, presumably the noise of the pulley system was from the kiyor being raised from the bor. This shows that the kiyor was lowered into the bor all night, and poses a challenge to **R' Chisda**!? **A:** The noise came from the Kohen *lowering* the kiyor into the bor for daybreak.
  - **Q:** A pulley system wouldn't be needed for the lowering of the kiyor, so why would that create noise? **A:** The pulley was used for the lowering as well so as to create noise, to summon the other Kohanim that it was time to come.
    - **Q:** They had Gevini the announcer who would announce to them that it was time to come!? **A:** They wanted to have two signals that it was time to come, so that people had two opportunities to be told that the time had come.

-----Daf כב-----22-----

- The Gemara earlier said, **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said, if a kiyor does not have enough water for 4 Kohanim it may not be used for the washing of the hands and feet, based on the pasuk of "v'rachatzu mimenu Moshe v'Aharon ubanav".
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, all keilim make the water inside them kodesh so that the water can be used for the washing of the hands and feet, whether they have a revi'is or not, as long as it is a kli shareis. This refutes **R' Yose**!? **A:** **R' Ada bar Acha** said, the case of the Braisa is where they drilled a hole into the kiyor and had the water flow from it into a keili. It is in that case that even a small amount of water in a keili is enough.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The pasuk says “mimenu”, which means that the washing must be done directly from the kiyor itself!? **A:** The pasuk says “yirchatzu”, which comes to include washing from a kli shareis as well.
  - **Q:** If so, even a keili that is not a kli shareis should be valid as well!? **A: Abaye** said, such a keili cannot be used based on a kal v’chomer – if the base of the kiyor, which was anointed along with the kiyor, cannot be used for the washing (as is taught in a Braisa), then a regular keili, which was never anointed, can surely not be used!
  - **Q: Mar Zutra the son of R’ Mari** asked **Ravina**, maybe the base is different, because it’s not meant for its inside to be used, but a keili which is, should be valid!? **A:** Rather, the word “mimenu” comes to exclude a keili that is not kodesh.
    - **Q:** Why doesn’t this word also exclude a kli shareis? **A:** The word “yirchatzu” comes to include it. Since a kli shareis is anointed like the kiyor itself, it makes sense that it should be included and that a regular keili is the one to be excluded.
- **Reish Lakish** said, whatever can be used to complete the amount necessary for a mikvah can also be used to complete the amount necessary for the kiyor, but cannot be counted towards the revi’is of water needed for netilas yadayim.
  - **Q:** What is this coming to exclude? It can’t come to exclude a liquid mud, because if it is liquid enough for a cow to drink it, it should even count for the revi’is as well, and if it is too thick for a cow, it should not be counted for a mikvah!? It can’t come to exclude the little bugs found in, and created in, the water, because one may even be toivel in 40 se’ah of these bugs themselves!? **A: R’ Pappa** said, **Reish Lakish** was referring to the case of a Mishna which says that if there is a mikvah with exactly 40 se’ah, and a person puts in a se’ah of some other liquid and then removes a se’ah of the mikvah, the mikvah remains valid. **Reish Lakish** means that the same would be with regard to the kiyor, but this would not apply to the revi’is.
    - **R’ Pappa** said, if a person digs into a mikvah and creates a place that can hold a revi’is of the mikvah water, one can toivel his small utensils there, since the water came from a valid mikvah.
- **R’ Yirmiya in the name of Reish Lakish** said, mikvah water is fit to be used for water of the kiyor (by taking water from a mikvah and transferring it to the kiyor).
  - **Q:** Does that mean that the water of the kiyor need not be “mayim chayim” (fresh spring water)? **A:** Braisa says that the korbon must be washed with water and darshens that the word “mayim” excludes using wine, excludes using even diluted wine, and comes to include other water (water that is not from a fresh spring), and with a kal v’chomer we can learn that water from the kiyor may be used. Now what is the kal v’chomer? Presumably it is that the kiyor has mayim chayim and can therefore surely be used!? **A:** The kal v’chomer is the fact that the water of the kiyor is kadosh, not that it is necessarily mayim chayim.
    - **Q:** The fact that it is kadosh is not an advantage for this purpose! **Shmuel** taught a Braisa that says that the water of the kiyor would not be valid, because it is called “kadosh water”! Rather, it must be that the kal v’chomer is that the water of the kiyor is mayim chayim!? **A:** It is actually a machlokes among Tanna’im. We find that **R’ Yochanan** said that **R’ Yishmael** says the water of the kiyor must be mayim chayim and the **Chachomim** say it may be of other waters.

### AREL

- This halacha is learned from a pasuk in Sefer Yechezkel. A Braisa explains the pasuk to be referring to one who has an “uncircumcised heart”, in that he has turned against Hashem, and also refers to one who has not had a bris milah. Both of these must be referred to separately in the pasuk. If we only knew about one without a bris milah, we would say he is passul because it is considered disgusting. If we only knew about one with the “uncircumcised heart”, we would say he is passul because he has gone against Hashem (but one without a bris milah may be valid).

### TAMEI PASSUL

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Elders of the South said, the avodah of a tamei is passul only if he is tamei from a sheretz. However, if he is tamei meis, since the avodah of a tamei meis is mutar for a tzibbur, the avodah of a tamei meis will be valid b'dieved for an individual's korbon as well.
  - **Q:** We should make a kal v'chomer – if tamei meis, which needs to be sprinkled upon from the parah adumah, is mutar for a korbon tzibbur, then definitely a tamei sheretz should be mutar for a korbon tzibbur!? **A:** The Elders of the South hold that the one bringing the kapparah (the Kohen) is like the one getting the kapparah (the tzibbur). Just as the tzibbur may bring the korbon when they are tamei, only if they are tamei meis, the same is true for the Kohen.
  - **Q:** What do they hold regarding an individual who is tamei sheretz on the 14<sup>th</sup> of Nisson? If they hold that he cannot be included in a Korbon Pesach, and must instead be pushed off for Pesach Sheini, then the tzibbur should be able to bring the Pesach when they are tamei sheretz, because for anything that an individual is pushed off to Pesach Sheini, a tzibbur in that situation would be allowed to bring the korbon!? **A:** They must hold that a person who is tamei sheretz on the 14<sup>th</sup> of Nisson could be included in a Korbon Pesach.

### -----Daf 23-----

- The Gemara is discussing the view of the Elders of the South, that a tamei Kohen's avodah is passul only when he is tamei from a sheretz, not when he is tamei meis.
  - **Ulla** said, **Reish Lakish** objected to this view. He said, which has a stronger power to be able to bring a korbon when tamei – the Kohen or the owner of the korbon? It is the owner of the korbon, because when he is tamei sheretz he can still have his Korbon Pesach offered for him, but a Kohen who is tamei sheretz and does the avodah makes the avodah passul. Now, if in a place when the owner is tamei sheretz he may still send his korbon to be offered and yet a Kohen who is tamei sheretz who does the avodah would make the avodah passul, then in a place where if the owner is tamei meis he may not bring the korbon, for sure a Kohen who is tamei meis who does the avodah should make it passul! Yet, you hold that the avodah of this Kohen would be valid!?
    - The Gemara says, the Elders of the South hold that an owner who is tamei meis *may* send his Korbon Pesach to be offered, and therefore we don't have this question.
      - **Q:** The pasuk seems to clearly say that a tamei meis may not send his Pesach to be offered (and must instead wait for Pesach Sheini)!? **A:** The pasuk is teaching l'chatchila. However, b'dieved if he sent it he will fulfill his obligation even though he can't eat it.
      - **Q:** The pasuk says "ish lefi achlo", which teaches that a Pesach may only be shechted on behalf of someone who can eat it!? **A:** That is l'chatchila.
        - **Q:** A Braisa learns from a pasuk, based on a hekesh, that even b'dieved it could not be shechted for someone who cannot eat it!? **A:** The Elders of the South do not make this hekesh.
        - **Q:** Still, we can ask on them based on a kal v'chomer - if in a place when the owner is tamei sheretz he may still send his korbon to be offered l'chatchila and yet a Kohen who is tamei sheretz who does the avodah would make the avodah passul, then in a place where if the owner is tamei meis he may not bring the korbon l'chatchila, for sure a Kohen who is tamei meis who does the avodah should make it passul!?
        - **Q:** A Mishna says, with regard to a nazir and the one doing a Pesach, the tzitz effects acceptance for tumah of the blood, but not for tumah of the body (the case is where the owner of the korbon became tamei). Now, this can't be referring to where he became tamei sheretz, because you have already said that for such tumah a person can bring the Pesach! Rather, it must be referring to tumas meis, and the Mishna says that the tzitz would not effect acceptance, which means that a tamei meis may not send his Pesach to be offered, and if he

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

does it will be passul!? **A:** The case is where the Kohen became tamei sheretz. However, in a case where the owner was tamei meis, if he sent his Pesach he would have fulfilled his obligation b'dieved.

- **Q:** The Mishna continues and says that if he became tamei with “tumah of the deep” (a tumah that was not known to anybody) the tzitz does effect acceptance. Now according to what you have said, this is referring to tumas sheretz. However, **R’ Chiya** taught a Braisa that says that “tumah of the deep” only applies to tumas meis, which presumably comes to exclude and say that it does not apply to tumas sheretz!? **A:** It comes to exclude “tumah of the deep” of zivah. But, it would apply to tumas sheretz, and it applies to both the owner and to the Kohen.
  - **Q:** We find that **Rami bar Chama** asks whether “tumah of the deep” applies to the Kohen or only to the owner. Based on your explanation of the Mishna he should be able to answer from the Mishna that it applies to the Kohen as well!? **A:** They clearly argue on **Rami bar Chama**, who would hold that if a Pesach is offered on behalf of someone who is tamei meis, it would be passul.
  - **Q:** A Braisa darshens pesukim to teach that the tzitz brings acceptance for tumah, since we find that there is an exception to the psul of tumah in the case of the tzibbur. Now, this can’t be referring to tumas sheretz, because there is no exception for this tumah for the tzibbur (if a person is tamei sheretz he may bring his Pesach on the 14<sup>th</sup> and doesn’t have to wait for Pesach Sheini, therefore if a tzibbur was tamei the psul of tumah would not be put aside). Rather, it refers to tumas meis, and presumably refers to where the owner became tamei meis. We see that if the tamei meis sends his korbon the tzitz would make it accepted. Now, this can’t refer to a korbon nazir, because if a nazir becomes tamei meis he loses his entire nezirus count. Rather, it must refer to Korbon Pesach and we see that a tamei meis can send his Pesach to be offered!? **A:** The Braisa may be referring to tumas sheretz, and the Braisa means that the concept of tumah has an exception, not that there is an exception of tumas sheretz itself.

### YOSHEIV

- **Q:** How do we know this psul? **A:** **Rava in the name of R’ Nachman** said, the pasuk says that Hashem chose the Kohen “laamod ulishareis” – to stand and do the Avodah, not to sit.
  - A Braisa says, “laamod ulishareis” teaches this is a mitzvah and “ha’omdim” repeats the requirement to make it essential.
  - **Q:** **Rava** asked **R’ Nachman**, a Kohen who does the avodah when sitting is like a zar and his avodah is passul. If so, we should say that he is also chayuv misah at the Hands of Heaven like a zar!? So, why does a Braisa say that he is not chayuv misah? **A:** The reason is that the case of a Kohen who does the avodah without wearing the bigdei kehunah and the case of a Kohen who does the avodah without washing his hands and feet are two pesukim that both teach that he is chayuv misah, and therefore this rule cannot be applied to other cases. Even according to the view that we can learn from a place where there are two pesukim teaching the same thing, in this case we cannot, because there is a third pasuk, the pasuk of a Kohen who does the avodah after drinking wine, that teaches the same thing, and all agree that when there are three pesukim that teach the same thing this rule cannot be applied to other cases.

-----Daf 72-----24-----

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** taught a Braisa, that explains the reason as being – the floor of the Azarah is kadosh and the klei shareis are kadosh. Just as there can be no chatzitza between the Kohen and the klei shareis, there can similarly be no chatzitza between the Kohen and the Azarah floor.
- The Mishna gave 3 examples – a Kohen who is standing on a keili, on an animal, and on the feet of another Kohen. All 3 are necessary to be taught. If we were only taught about a keili, we would say, that is a chatzitza because it is not a form of flesh, but an animal, which is a form of flesh, would not be considered a chatzitza. If we were taught that an animal is a chatzitza, we would say that an animal is a chatzitza because it is different than a human, but if he stands on the feet of another Kohen it would not be considered a chatzitza. That is why we need all 3.
- A Braisa says, **R' Eliezer** said, if the Kohen has one foot on a keili and one on the Azarah floor, or one foot on a stone and one foot on the floor, we make a determination – if we were to pull away the keili or the stone and the Kohen would be able to stand on the other foot and do the avodah, the avodah he does is valid. If not, it is passul.
  - **Q: R' Ami** asked, what if he is standing on a loose stone of the Azarah floor? Now, if they don't intend to reattach this stone it would definitely be a chatzitza. The question is where they do intend to reattach it.
    - **Q: R' Zuti** said that **R' Ami** asked – if a stone of the floor was removed and the Kohen stood in the empty place where the stone used to be, would the avodah be valid?
      - The question is, when Dovid Hamelech made the floor kadosh, did he do so only for the top layer of stone, or did he make that area kadosh until the depths of the earth below?
        - The Gemara says, if that is the question, he should have asked for the halacha in the case of where the entire floor was removed. Rather, he was sure that Dovid had made the area kadosh until the depths of the earth below. His question was, is this considered a proper way to do the avodah or not? **TEIKU**.

### KIBEIL BISMOL PASSUL V'REBBI SHIMON MACHSHIR

- A Braisa says, we darshen the pasuk that says “b'etzba'oh” and “v'lakach” to teach that just as the “etzbah” refers to the finger on his right hand, so too the kabbalah must be done with his right hand. The pasuk also says “v'nossan”, which teaches that the putting of the blood on the Mizbe'ach must also be done with the right hand. **R' Shimon** said, the pasuk doesn't say “yad” regarding kabbalah. Rather, it only says “etzba'oh” and “v'nossan”, which teaches that the putting of the blood must be done with the right hand. However, since it doesn't say “yad” regarding kabbalah, it is even valid if done with the left hand.
  - **Q: If R' Shimon** holds of the gezeira shava that teaches that “yad” refers to the right hand, then even if “yad” is not written regarding kabbalah it should still need to be done with the right hand, because the word “etzbah” is written regarding it and there is a similar gezeira shava that teaches that “etzbah” also refers to the right hand!? If he does not hold of the gezeira shava of “yad”, then why does it make a difference that the word “yad” is not written regarding kabbalah? **A: R' Yehuda** said, he actually does not hold of this gezeira shava. What he said is – since it does not say “right hand” by kabbalah, even when done with the left hand it will be valid.
    - **Q: Rabbah** asked, if so, the putting of the blood on the Mizbe'ach should also be able to be done with the left hand!? Also, a Braisa clearly says that he *does* hold of the gezeira shava of yad and etzbah, which teaches that both refer to the right hand!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, **R' Shimon** holds of the gezeira shava, and in the Braisa he said as follows – it does not say “yad” by kabbalah, rather it says the word “etzbah”. Now, since kabbalah can't be done with one finger (he can't hold a kli shareis with a finger), the word “etzbah” must not be referring to the kabbalah, and therefore a kabbalah done with left hand would be valid.
      - **Q: R' Sama the son of R' Ashi** asked **Ravina**, an “ear” (handle) can be made on the kli shareis, which would make it possible to be held with one finger!? **A:** Rather, **Abaye** said, the word “etzbah” is written in between the words “v'lakach” (which is the kabbalah) and “v'nossan” (which is the putting of the blood). The **T”K** holds we can darshen for an earlier part of the pasuk and for a later part of the pasuk, whereas **R'**



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

**Shimon** says we only darshen for the later part of the pasuk, and not the earlier part of the pasuk.

- **Abaye** said, **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** argues on his father and on the **Rabbanan** (the **T"K**). A Braisa says, **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** says, whenever the pasuk says "etzbah" regarding the kabbalah, but not in regard to the putting of the blood on the Mizbe'ach, then if the kabbalah was done with the left hand it is passul, but if the placing of the blood was done with the left hand it would be valid. Whenever the pasuk says "etzbah" regarding the putting of the blood, but not in regard to the kabbalah, then if the putting of the blood was done with the left hand it is passul, but if the kabbalah was done with the left hand it would be valid.
- **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, whenever a pasuk says "etzbah" and some form of the word "kehunah", it refers to the right hand.
  - Initially this was understood that both words are necessary to require that the right hand be used. However, regarding kemitza, only the verbiage of "kehuna" is used and yet a Mishna says that if it was done with the left hand it is passul!? Therefore, **Rava** explained that he meant *either* "etzbah" or "kehunah" would require that the avodah be done with the right hand.
    - **Q: Abaye** asked, the pasuk regarding bringing the pieces of the animal to the ramp of the Mizbe'ach uses the word "Kohen", and yet a Mishna says that it may be done with the left hand!? **A: Rava** said, the word "etzbah" or "kehuna" only require using the right hand for an avodah that is essential to bring about the kapparah.
      - **Q: Regarding kabbalah** the pasuk says "Kohanim" and yet **R' Shimon** says that it is valid if it was done with the left hand!? **A: R' Shimon** holds that *both* words need to be written in the pasuk to make using the right hand absolutely essential.
        - **Q: A Braisa** says that **R' Shimon** holds that the word "yad" alone and the word "etzbah" alone refer to the right hand!? **A: The word "etzbah"** alone would require using the right hand. However, the word "kehuna" would only require the right hand when it is written along with the word "etzbah", not by itself.
        - **Q: If so, why is the word "kehuna" needed at all?** **A: It is to teach that the kabbalah must be done while wearing the bigdei kehunah.**
        - **Q: Regarding the zrika** the pasuk only uses the word "kehuna" and a Mishna says that if it is done with the left hand it is passul, and **R' Shimon** does not argue there!? **A: Abaye** said, **R' Shimon** does argue on this halacha in a Braisa.
- **Q: Rava** teaches elsewhere that there is a gezeira shava on the word "yad" that teaches that kemitza must be done with the right hand. Now, the pasuk of kemitza uses the term kehunah, so according to **Rabbah bar bar Chana** why do we need a gezeira shava to teach that it must be done with the right hand? **A: One is needed to teach that the kemitza must be done with the right hand, and the other is needed to teach that when it is then placed into a kli shareis, that kli shareis must be held in the Kohen's right hand.**
  - **Q: According to R' Shimon**, who says that the kemitza does not need to be put into a kli shareis, and according to the view that says that he does, but that he would say that it is valid if done with the left hand, what does he learn from **Rava's** gezeira shava? It can't be coming to teach that the kemitza must be done with the right hand, because **R' Yehuda the son of R' Chiya** said that **R' Shimon** learns that from a pasuk!? **A: It is needed to teach that the kemitza of a chatas mincha must be done with the right hand. We would think that since he holds it is brought without oil and levonah (so as not to make the chatas be of the best type of mincha) it would also be valid if done with the left hand. The gezeira shava therefore teaches that it is passul if done with the left hand.**

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 72-----25-----

## MISHNA

- If the blood spilled onto the floor (directly from the neck of the animal, without having been put into a keili), and the Kohen then gathered it up, it is passul.

## GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “v’lakach haKohen hamoshiach midam hapar”. This teaches that the Kohen must take from the lifeblood of the animal and not from the blood of the skin or of the blood after the lifeblood. Further, “midam hapar” should be understood as saying “dam meihapar” – he must get the blood directly from the neck of the animal.
  - The Gemara explains, “midam hapar” can’t be understood the way it is written, because then it would be teaching “midam” – from the blood but not all the blood. This can’t be right, because **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** has said that the pasuk of “v’es kol damo yishpoch” teaches that it must be *all* the blood. Rather, the Braisa is to be understood as explained above, and the Tanna holds that we may add and take away letters from words and then darshen it.
    - **Q:** The pasuk of “v’es kol damo yishpoch” refers to the pouring of the leftover blood onto the base of the Mizbe’ach, not the blood that is put onto the corners of the Mizbe’ach. If so, how can we say that it refers to the kabbalah? **A:** It can’t mean that *all* the blood must be poured onto the base, because some of the blood has already been put onto the corners of the Mizbe’ach. Therefore, it can’t be understood as referring to leftover blood and should instead be understood as referring to the kabbalah.
  - **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, when shechting a korbon, the knife must be raised after the shechita so that the blood does not go from the knife into the keili, because the pasuk of “midam hapar” teaches that the blood must come straight from the animal, not from something else.
    - **Q:** How do we clean the knife from the blood before using it again? **A: Abaye** said, he wipes it on the rim of the keili used for the kabbalah.
  - **R’ Chisda in the name of R’ Yirmiya bar Abba** said, when the shechita is being done, he must put the “vridin” (the two main blood vessels) over the keili so that the blood flows directly into the keili. **R’ Assi in the name of R’ Yochanan** said a similar ruling as well.
  - **Q: R’ Assi** asked **R’ Yochanan**, if during the kabbalah the bottom of the keili broke open before the blood reached the airspace in the keili, but after it reached the airspace above the keili, what is the halacha? Do we say that airspace above a place where something will not eventually land is considered as if it has landed there or not? **A: R’ Yochanan** said, a Braisa requiring collecting water for use with the parah adumah says that if the water is flowing from a high place and into the keili without intent to make it kadosh for this purpose, the water in the keili and in the airspace above the keili is passul. We see that water in the airspace above the keili is considered to be as if resting in the keili.
    - **Q: R’ Assi** asked regarding a case where it will not eventually actually land in the keili, and **R’ Yochanan** answered from a case where it eventually will come to land in the keili!? **A: R’ Assi** actually asked about both cases, and **R’ Yochanan** answered one of the questions.
    - **R’ Yosef** had this version of the question and answer. **R’ Kahana** said, the question was regarding the water above the keili in the case of the para adumah and the answer was therefore directly on point. **Rabbah** said, the question was regarding the water for the para adumah and the answer was from the case of the vridin and the blood in the airspace above the keili.
  - A Mishna says, if someone helps to direct the flow of water for the para adumah by using his hand, his foot, or vegetable leaves, the water becomes passul. If he uses the leaves of reeds or of nuts, it is valid. The rule is, if anything that is mekabel tumah is used, it is passul. If anything that is not mekabel tumah is used, it is valid. **R’ Yochanan in the name of R’ Yose bar Abba** explains, the pasuk says “yihiyeh tahor”, which teaches that it must flow only using things which can’t even become tamei.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, we see from here that the airspace above a keili has the status of the keili itself (if not, then when the water runs off his hand into the airspace above the keili, the water should again become valid. From the fact that it remains passul, this shows that since it went from his hand directly into the airspace, it is as if it went from his hand directly into the keili, and that is why it is passul). **R' Zeira** asked **R' Chiya bar Abba**, maybe the case is that the water dripped from his hand into the keili, without even entering the airspace, and that is why it is passul? He answered, that can't be, because the Braisa says that he put his hand there so that the "water pass over the keili", which means that it went into the airspace.
- **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** also said, this Mishna was taught based on the testimony of **R' Tzadok**, who testified that when nut leaves were used to direct the flow of the water in an actual case, the **Rabanan** said it was valid.
- **R' Zeira in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if someone shechted a par, then nicked its ear, and then did kabbalah, it is passul. This is because the pasuk says "v'lakach midam hapar", which teaches that the kabbalah must be done with the same par that is needed for the shechita – without a mum.
  - **Q:** This provides a source for korbanos of kodshei kodashim. How do we know this applies to kodshei kalim as well? **A: Rava** said, a Braisa says, the pasuk regarding Korbon Pesach (which is kodshei kalim) says, "seh samim zachar ben shanah", which teaches that it must be without a mum and within its first year at the time of the shechita. How do we know that it must remain so at the time of the kabbalah, at the time of the holacha, and at the time of the zrika? The pasuk says "yihiyeh". We see that the same is for kodshei kalim.
    - **Abaye** asked, **R' Yehoshua** says in a Braisa, with regard to all korbanos that were shechted and the meat or cheilev were destroyed or became tamei, as long as there is at least a kezayis that remains, we may do a zrika and the korbon is valid. Now, this obviously means that the animal became blemished after the shechita, which means that the previous Braisa means that the Pesach must be in its first year for all other avodos, but not that it must be without a mum. If so, we have no basis specific for kodshei kalim. Instead we would learn it from kodshei kodashim.
      - **Q:** How can it be that at the time of shechita it was within its first year, but at the time of the holacha or zrika it was beyond its first year? **A: Rava** said, we see from here that we count the hours to determine the age of an animal for a korbon.
  - **R' Ami in the name of R' Elazar** said, if a korbon is in the Azarah but its legs are outside, and he then cut off the legs and then shechted the animal, it is a valid korbon. If he first shechted the animal and then cut off the legs, it is passul.
    - **Q:** If he cuts off the legs before the shechita it is a baal mum, so how can it be valid!? **A:** Rather, what he said is that if after the shechita he cut off the legs and then did kabbalah it is valid, but if he did the kabbalah and then cut off the legs, it is passul.
      - **Q: R' Zeira** taught based on the pasuk that if the animal got a mum after the shechita and before the kabbalah, it is passul!? **A: R' Chisda in the name of Avimi** said, the person must cut the leg until the bone. In that way the blood from the legs will not be part of the kabbalah, and the animal also does not become a baal mum.
      - From the fact that if he doesn't cut off the legs until after the kabbalah it is passul, we can learn that the blood of the limbs (i.e. of the legs) are considered to be blood of the korbon and that is why it becomes passul if it left the Azarah.
        - The Gemara says this is no proof. It may be that it becomes assur because of the fats in the legs, which are considered to be meat of the korbon that left the Azarah.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Maybe this proves that meat of kodshei kalim that left the Azarah before the zrika is passul? **A:** It may be that **R' Ami** was talking about kodshei kodashim.

### -----Daf 15-----26-----

- A Braisa says, kodshei kodashim must be shechted in the north of the Azarah, and the kabbalah of their blood must be done in the north. If he stood in the south part of the Azarah and stuck his hand into the north and shechted the animal there, the shechita is valid. If he did the same thing for the kabbalah, it would be passul. If his head and most of his body was in the north, it is as if he was entirely in the north. If, after the shechita, the animal convulsed and went into the south part of the Azarah and then returned to the north, it is valid. With regard to kodshei kalim, their shechita must be done inside the Azarah, and the kabbalah of their blood must be done inside the Azarah. If he stood outside the Azarah and stuck his hand inside and shechted the animal there, the shechita is valid. If he did the same thing for the kabbalah, it would be passul. If his head and most of his body was in the Azarah, it is as if he was not in the Azarah at all. If, after the shechita, the animal convulsed and went outside the Azarah and then returned inside, it is passul.
  - **Q:** This would suggest that kodshei kalim meat that left the Azarah before the zrika would be passul! **A:** This is no proof, because the Braisa may be speaking about the tail, the diaphragm, and the kidneys (which all go on the Mizbe'ach), but it may be that the meat remains mutar even if it left the Azarah before the zrika.
  - **Shmuel's** father asked **Shmuel**, if an animal is inside the Azarah, but its legs are outside, may it be shechted like that? **Shmuel** said, the pasuk says "vehevi'um laHashem", which teaches that the entire animal must be inside the Azarah.
    - He then asked, what if the animal is hanging in the Azarah (off the floor)? **Shmuel** said, it would be valid. His father told him, you are mistaken. The shechita must be done "at the side of the Mizbe'ach", and this can't be said to have been done so when hanging in the air.
    - He then asked, what if the person doing the shechita was hanging in the air? **Shmuel** said, it is passul. His father told him, you are mistaken. It is the shechita that must be done "at the side of the Mizbe'ach", but the one doing the shechita need not be there.
    - He then asked, what if the kabbalah was done while the Kohen was hanging (off the floor)? **Shmuel** said, it would be valid. His father told him, you are mistaken. The kabbalah is an avodah, and doing an avodah while hanging is not a proper avodah.
    - He then asked, what if the kabbalah was done while the animal was hanging (off the floor)? **Shmuel** said, it is passul. His father told him, you are mistaken. It is the shechita that must be done "at the side of the Mizbe'ach", but the kabbalah need not be done there.
    - **Abaye** said, with regard to kodshei kodashim, all these cases are passul except for the case of where the person doing the shechita was hanging. With regard to kodshei kalim all these cases are valid except for the case of where the Kohen doing the kabbalah was hanging.
      - **Q: Rava** asked, why is it that for kodshei kalim it is valid when the kabbalah is done while the animal is hanging, because we consider the airspace of the Azarah to be as the Azarah itself, but for kodshei kodashim we say that the airspace of the "north" is not considered to be like the north itself? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said that with regard to kodshei kodashim and kodshei kalim all these cases are valid except for the case of where the animal was hanging while it was shechted when it was kodshei kodashim, and the case of the Kohen who did the kabbalah while he was hanging, whether it was for kodshei kodashim or kodshei kalim.
  - **R' Yirmiya** asked **R' Zeira**, what if the person is in the Azarah but his hair is outside the Azarah? **R' Zeira** said, just as we said that the pasuk of "vehevi'um laHashem" teaches that the entire animal must be within the Azarah, so too the pasuk of "b'vo'am ehl ohel mo'eid" teaches that the entire Kohen must be in the Azarah.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### MISHNA

- If the Kohen put the blood on the ramp instead of the Mizbe'ach wall, or on a part of the Mizbe'ach not opposite its base, or if he put blood that should have been put below the red line above the red line, or visa-versa, or he put blood that should have been put inside the Heichal outside of the Heichal, or visa-versa, it is passul but there is no kares.

### GEMARA

- **Shmuel** said, the meat is passul to be eaten in these cases, but the owner has achieved his kapparah. This is based on the pasuk of “va'ani nisativ lachem ahl hamizbe'ach l'chaper”, which teaches that once the blood of a korbon reaches any part of the Mizbe'ach, the owner has achieved his kapparah.
  - **Q:** If so, the meat should also be mutar to be eaten!? **A:** The pasuk says “l'chaper”, which teaches that it is only valid for purposes of achieving a kapparah, not for any other purpose.
  - We see from here that **Shmuel** holds that at least with respect to kapparah, putting the blood not in its proper place is like putting the blood in its proper place.
    - **Q:** A Mishna says, that if the blood was applied in the wrong place, if there is still lifeblood coming from the animal, a valid Kohen should go get some of that blood and put the blood in the proper place. Now, if blood put in the wrong place is as if it is put in the right place, why should he have to go and get more blood to be properly applied? You can't say that this second zrika would make the meat mutar to be eaten, because there is no such thing as a zrika that doesn't accomplish a kapparah but that can still make the meat mutar to eat!? **A:** The Mishna is talking about where the original zrika was done by someone who was passul to do it. That is why we have a valid Kohen do a new, valid zrika.
  - **Q:** If a passul person did the zrika, the remaining blood should become rejected!? A Mishna says, if a passul person was mekabel the blood with a piggul intent, then if there is more lifeblood, a valid Kohen should be mekabel that blood and do a valid zrika. This suggests that the ability to do a second zrika is only because the passul person was only mekabel the blood, but if he had already done a zrika it seems that another zrika would not even be an option, presumably because the remaining blood became rejected upon the first zrika!? **A:** The reason the second zrika could not be done is because the piggul intent of the passul person made the korbon passul.
    - **Q:** If so, then even if the passul person only did a kabbalah it should be passul!? Further, **Rava** says that a piggul intent only makes the korbon passul if it was had by someone who is fit to do the avodah, with something that is fit for the avodah, and in a place that is fit for the avodah!? **A:** The inference from the Mishna should not be that if a passul person did the zrika a valid Kohen can no longer do the zrika. Rather, the inference should be that if a passul person did the shechita with that intent, a valid Kohen cannot do the avodah in a way that will then make the korbon valid.
      - **Q:** A Mishna already says that a passul person's intent during the shechita makes the korbon passul (since such a person is valid for the shechita of a korbon)!? **A:** The Mishna is teaching that from the kabbalah and onward the improper intent of a passul person will not make the korbon passul, as **Rava** has said.