



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Zevachim Daf Chuf

- **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.

- **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 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.