

20 Iyar 5778  
May 5, 2018



Zevachim Daf 22

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

### **Other Vessels**

It was stated above: Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina said that any *Kiyor* that does not contain enough water to wash four *Kohanim* is not valid to use for this washing. This is as the verse states: *And Moshe, Aaron, and his sons will wash from it.*

The *Gemora* asks from the following *braisa*: All vessels can sanctify (*the water to be used to wash the Kohanim*) whether they contain a *revi'is*, or whether they do not contain a *revi'is*, as long as they are service vessels!?

Rav Ada bar Acha answers: The case of the *braisa* is where one bores a small hole in the *Kiyor* and attaches a small vessel to it, allowing the water of the *Kiyor* go through the small vessel. [*Even though the vessel itself does not contain water for four, there is water for four in the Kiyor.*]

The *Gemora* asks: Doesn't the Torah say: *from it*?

The *Gemora* answers: *They would wash* includes any service vessel.

The *Gemora* asks: Why don't we say this also includes ordinary non-sacred vessels?

Abaye answers: You cannot include non-sacred vessels, as there is a *kal vachomer* from the base of the *Kiyor*. If the base of the *Kiyor* was anointed together with the *Kiyor* but it cannot be used for sanctification, certainly non-sacred vessels cannot be used for sanctification.

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know its base cannot be used for sanctification?

It was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Yehudah says that one might think that the base can be used for sanctification like the *Kiyor*. This is why the verse states: *And you will make a Kiyor of copper and a base of copper*. This indicates that the base is compared to the *Kiyor* regarding copper (*that it should be made from copper*), and not for any other matters.

Mar Zutra the son of Rav Mari said to Ravina: Just because the base, which is not made for the inside of it to be used, cannot be used for sanctification, how is this a proof that a non-sacred vessel, which is made for the inside of it to be used, cannot be used for sanctification?

Rather, the *Gemora* states: The verse *from it* excludes non-sacred vessels.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, let it exclude service vessels as well!?

[*The verse seems to be saying that they should specifically be washed from it, meaning the Kiyor!*]

The *Gemora* answers: They should sanctify is inclusive (*and indicates that we should include other service vessels*).

The *Gemora* asks: Why should we only include service vessels and not non-sacred vessels?

The *Gemora* answers: Service vessels require anointment like the *Kiyor*, as opposed to non-sacred vessels which do not require anointment. (21b – 22a)

### Completing the Amount

Rish Lakish says: Any water that can help complete the amount of water required for a *mikvah*, can help complete the amount required in the *Kiyor* (for four *Kohanim*). However, it cannot be used to complete the *revi'is* required for washing of the hands (*netilas yadayim*).

The *Gemora* asks: What does this exclude? If it excludes liquid mud that can be poured from one vessel to another, what is the case? If (it is so thin that) a cow would stoop down to drink from it, it should even be used for *netilas yadayim*!? If a cow would not stoop down to drink from it, it should not even be used to complete the amount needed for a *mikvah*!?

Rather, the *Gemora* answers: It excludes red midges (little bugs without wings that develop from water).

The *Gemora* asks: The entire *mikvah* can be made up of these bugs!? This is as the *braisa* states: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says that anything that was developed from water can be used for immersion. Rav Yitzchak bar Avdimi stated (based on this): One can immerse himself in the (dissolved) eye of a (huge) fish.

Rav Pappa answers: What is being excluded are liquids (i.e. fruit juice, milk, blood or wine – liquids that are not regarded as water) that when a *se'ah* of them is put into a *mikvah*, and a *se'ah* of the mixture is taken out, the *mikvah* is still valid. [However, if there was water for a *mikvah* minus one *se'ah*, a *se'ah* of these liquids would not make the *mikvah* valid.] This is as the *Mishna* states: If a *mikvah* has exactly forty *se'ah* (the minimum quantity required for a valid *mikvah*), and a *se'ah* of these liquids are put in, and a *se'ah* of the mixture is taken out, it remains a valid *mikvah*. [The *se'ah* of unsuitable

liquid is regarded as having been nullified in the forty *se'ah* of water, so that when one *se'ah* of the mixture was subsequently removed, the minimum of forty *se'ah* of suitable liquid still remained in the *mikvah*.] Rav Yehudah bar Shila says in the name of Rav Assi in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: This procedure (of adding one *seah* of unsuitable liquid and removing one *seah*) can only be repeated until the *mikvah* contains a majority of these liquids.

Rav Pappa says: If someone bored a small hole in the wall of the *mikvah*, he could immerse needles and small tubes there, as the water is coming from the valid waters of the *mikvah*. (22a)

### What Water?

Rabbi Yirmiyah says in the name of Rish Lakish: Water from a *mikvah* can be used for the water of the *Kiyor*.

The *Gemora* asks: This implies that living water (from a spring) is not necessary. Doesn't the *braisa* state: In water (the parts of the *olah* are washed in water). This indicates that they are not washed in wine or diluted wine. With water includes other water (that is not from a spring), and certainly the water of the *Kiyor*. What does this indicate? It must mean that the *Kiyor* contains living water!?

The *Gemora* answers: This is not what it indicates. Rather, it indicates that it is sanctified.

The *Gemora* asks: Is it an advantage to use sanctified water (for the washing of the *olah*)? Didn't Rabbi Shmuel teach a *braisa* that stated that whenever the Torah uses the term water, it includes all water that does not have an accompanying name; this would exclude the water of the *Kiyor*, as this is called water of the *Kiyor*? It must be that the *braisa* (when it said, "the water of the *Kiyor*," ) was referring to water that is fit to be in the *Kiyor*, which must mean spring water (and not water from a *mikvah*; this contradicts Rabbi Yirmiyah's ruling)!?

### Elders of the South

The *Gemora* answers: This is indeed an argument among the *Tannaim*. Rabbi Yochanan states: There is an dispute regarding the source of the waters of the *Kiyor*. Rabbi Yishmael says: It is spring water. The *Chachamim* say: It is other waters. (22a – 22b)

#### Uncircumcised

The *Mishna* stated that an uncircumcised person invalidates a Temple service.

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know this?

Rav Chisda says: We did not learn this from the Torah of Moshe Rabbeinu, but did learn it from the words of Yechezkel ben Buzi. The verse states: *Any stranger, one of uncircumcised heart or flesh shall not come to My Temple to serve me*. How do we know that they cause the service to be invalid? This is as the verse says: *When you bring strangers, the uncircumcised of heart or flesh to be in My Sanctuary, to desecrate My House*.

The *braisa* states: *Any stranger*. One might think this is literally referring to a gentile. This is why the verse states: *Uncircumcised of the heart (a sinner)*. Why, then, does it say *any stranger*? This is referring to someone whose actions have become strange to his Father in Heaven. We only know this refers to someone with an uncircumcised heart. How do we know this also applies to someone of uncircumcised flesh? The verse states: *And one of uncircumcised flesh*. Both of these verses are needed. If it would only say uncircumcised flesh, this is because he is physically repulsive before Hashem (*as he did not remove his foreskin*). However, one might think that a sinner who is not physically repulsive may serve. If it only said one of uncircumcised heart, one might think this is because his heart is not loyal to Heaven. However, one who merely is not circumcised might be valid. This is why both verses are necessary. (22b)

The *Mishna* stated that a person who is *tamei* causes the service to be invalid.

The Elders of the South (*great sages*) stated: This is only true regarding someone who is *tamei* due to a *sheretz*. However, regarding one who is *tamei* from a corpse, being that he can cause acceptance in the case of a public sacrifice, he can also cause acceptance in the case of a private sacrifice. [Although the *Kohanim* are forbidden to perform such a service from the outset, once performed, the power of the *tzitz* lifts the ineligibility and creates acceptance for these sacrifices.]

The *Gemora* asks: Why don't we derive that the service of a person who is *tamei* due to a *sheretz* is also acceptable, using a *kal vachomer* from one who is *tamei* due to a corpse? If one who is *tamei* from a corpse requires sprinkling from the ashes of the red heifer on the third and seventh day of his impurity, and yet he makes public sacrifices acceptable (*and he is even permitted to perform such a service at the outset*), certainly the service of one who is *tamei* from a *sheretz*, which does not require sprinkling from the ashes of the red heifer on the third and seventh day of his impurity, should make public sacrifices acceptable!?

The *Gemora* answers: The Elders of the South understand that those who cause atonement (*the Kohanim*) are compared to those for whom they atone (*the public*). Just as those who they atone for (*the public*) can have their sacrifice brought only if they are *tamei* from a corpse and not from a *sheretz*, so too the service of those who effect atonement (*the Kohanim*) is only valid if they are *tamei* from a corpse and not from a *sheretz*.

The *Gemora* asks: What do they hold (*regarding someone who was tamei from a sheretz at the time when he was obligated to bring the pesach offering*)? If they hold that we do not slaughter or sprinkle the blood of the *pesach* offering for one who is *tamei* from a *sheretz* (*but rather, he must bring*

his offering on Pesach sheini), why can't the entire public bring their pesach offerings if they are all *tamei* from a *sheretz*? Isn't the rule that if we would defer (on account of *tumah*) the pesach offering of an individual (to Pesach sheini), the public would offer the pesach sacrifice (in its proper time – even though they are *tamei*)!?

Rather, the *Gemora* answers: It must be that they hold that we do slaughter or sprinkle the blood of the pesach offering for one who is *tamei* from a *sheretz*.

Ulla says: Rish Lakish objected raucously at the Elders of the South. Whose power is greater (regarding the ability to offer sacrifices while *tamei*): Is it the power of those who effect atonement, or the power of those for whom atonement is made? It must be those who effect atonement (for you hold that the owner of a pesach offering can send it to the Temple even when he is *tamei* from a *sheretz*, whereas a *Kohen* cannot perform the service in this circumstance). Based upon this, let us say the following *kal vachomer*: If a person can send his pesach offering to be slaughtered even if he is *tamei* due to a *sheretz*, but a *Kohen* cannot render the service acceptable if he is *tamei* from a *sheretz*; then, in a case where the owners are *tamei* from a corpse, where he cannot send his pesach offering to be slaughtered, is it not reasonable to say that the *Kohen* atoning, who is *tamei* from a corpse, should certainly not have the ability to effect acceptance with his service!?

The *Gemora* answers: The Elders of the South hold that one who is *tamei* from a corpse can also send his offerings to be slaughtered.

The *Gemora* asks: But the Torah seems to say that such a person is deferred to Pesach sheini!?

The *Gemora* answers: The verse teaches us that it is a *mitzvah* for him to wait until Pesach sheini (however, if he sent his offering while he was *tamei*, it is also valid). (22b – 23a)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### **Washing one's Hands with Aquatic Insects and Immersion in Kerosene**

We associate sanctification our hands (*netilas yadayim*) and immersion in a *mikvah* with clear water. Yet our *sugya* cites Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, that a person can immerse in a *mikvah* made from the fat of the eye of a big fish or from red midges (*yavchushim*) as they are created from water and a product of water is regarded as water. In this article we shall examine the roots of this *halachah* by presenting cases described in the *Gemora* and *halachic* literature.

**Connecting mikvaos with yavchushim:** Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel cited another *halachah* on a similar basis (Mikvaos 6:7), that one can connect two *mikvaos* of water with a hole as wide as the tube of the opening of a leather bottle (about two fingers wide), through which the water of the *mikvaos* mix. However, if a foreign object lies in the hole and obstructs its width, the hole does not connect the *mikvaos*. Still, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says that if red *yavchushim* fill the hole, they do not decrease its width as they are regarded as water. However, here we find an apparent contradiction. Concerning immersion and *netilas yadayim*, Rambam (*Hilchos Mikvaos*, 8:11) rules according to Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, that one may immerse in red *yavchushim* whereas regarding connecting *mikvaos*, he rules (ibid., *halachah* 6) according to the *Chachamim*, that *mikvaos* cannot be connected if the hole is obstructed by *yavchushim*. Are water-insects regarded as water or not?

**Two aspects of immersion and netilas yadayim:** Leading *halachic* authorities devoted much attention to this question (see *Sefer HaMaftaiach*, ibid.). The Chazon Ish zt"l (Kodshim, *Likutim*, 1:5) explains that the *mitzvah* of immersion and the *mitzvah* of *netilas yadayim* contain two instructions: The first

is to wash one's hands or immerse one's body in material made of **water**. The second is to do it in a **liquid** that wets all the places needing immersion or *netilas yadayim*. Therefore, *yavchushim*, the fat of a fish's eye or other things created from water are considered water in regard to their **contents** but as long as they are solid and not liquid, we cannot apply the second rule to them and they are unfit for immersion or *netilas yadayim*. Therefore, we can say that our *sugya* is speaking about red insects that were crushed and are as liquid as water in every sense. However, the *Mishna* treating the *halachos* of *mikvaos* refers to whole insects, which lack the liquidity of water and cannot connect *mikvaos* (and thus it seems from Rashi on our *sugya*, s.v. *Be'eino*: "a big fish that the fat of its eye is **melted**).

The reader will have great pleasure if he opens *Shulchan 'Aruch*, O.C. 160:10, and reads the following *halachah*: "It is allowed to wash one's hands with anything created from water, such as red water-insects or fish fat" and the *Remo* adds "and it seems only if he crushed them" – a short statement containing a lot. (Another explanation of the above question is cited in the name of HaGaon Rav Yitzchak Zeev of Brisk zt"l. In his opinion, to connect two *mikvaos* we need *tofach al menas lehatpiach* - something so wet that something touching it can wet other things. Aquatic insects are regarded as water to wash the hands but they are "dry water" as they lack that attribute, and cannot join two *mikvaos*).

**Someone who immersed in a *mikvah* full of kerosene:**

HaGaon Rav Meir Arik zt"l, author of *Responsa Imrei Yosher* (II, 31) was asked to judge the case of a person who immersed in a *mikvah* when its heating system broke down and much kerosene leaked into the *mikvah*. After he discusses whether kerosene is a *chatzitzah* (interference) between the *mikvah* and one's body, he wonders whether kerosene, produced from the ground, can itself be regarded as water and fit for immersion. However, the author of *Responsa Imrei David* (222) denies this possibility. In his opinion, kerosene is not water and is unfit for immersion (see *Tevilas Keilim*, Ch. 7,

remark 2, and see the Rogatchover's reply in his approbation to *Piskei Teshuvah*, II).

***The Status and Function of the Kiyor***

The *sugyas* now being learnt deal, among other topics, with the *mitzvah* for the *kohanim* to wash their hands and feet before they serve in the Temple, as we are told: "...And you will make a *Kiyor* of copper...and Aharon and his sons will wash their hands and feet from it" (Shemos 30:18-19).

The *Kiyor* was a large vessel three or four *amos* wide (see *Tosfos Yom Tov*, Yoma 3:10) on a stand. At first it had only two taps. Later, in the era of the Second Temple, the *kohen gadol* Ben Katin made ten more taps so that the *kohanim* who won the lottery to sacrifice the morning *tamid* could wash their hands and feet all together. In addition, Ben Katin arranged a *muchani* for the *Kiyor* – i.e., a machine and, in Greek, a *galgal* (*'Aruch*, entry for *mechan*, and *Tosfos Yom Tov*, *ibid.*). The *muchani* was wooden and with its help the *Kiyor* was lowered into a reservoir of water so that its water would not be disqualified by staying overnight (Raavad, *Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*, 3:18). But according to Rambam, the *muchani* was a container that supplied water to the *Kiyor* according to need. Some explain (see *Tosfos Yom Tov*) that the *muchani* was a pump that constantly supplied water to the *Kiyor* (and see *Ya'vetz* on Rambam, *ibid.*, cited in *Sefer HaLikutim* in the Frenkel edition, and the *Meiri* on *Tamid*, end of Ch. 1).

**The *Kiyor* is different from the other *service shareis*:** It is surprising to discover that the *Kiyor* and its stand are missing from the list of objects in use in the Sanctuary counted in *parshayos Terumah* and *Tetzaveh*. Hashem's command to Moshe to make them appears in *Ki Tisa* (Shemos 30:18) between the *mitzvah* to give half a shekel and the *mitzvah* of the incense. Sforno (*ibid.*) explains that "this vessel was not mentioned above with the rest of the objects because its intent was not to induce the presence of the Shechinah in the Sanctuary like the intent of those objects as explained above,

but its purpose was to **prepare** the *kohanim* for their service.” In other words, the *Kiyor* was made only to serve the *kohanim*, as opposed to the other objects that had an exalted purpose. This does not denigrate from the *mitzvah* itself – the *mitzvah* of sanctifying the hands and feet – which was part of the service of the Temple and as explained in our *sugya*, a *kohen* had to wash his hands and feet while **standing** as in all the services of the Temple.

Rabbi Avraham Ibn Ezra (Shemos 35:16) even emphasizes that the *Kiyor* did not have rods to carry it by, as the other objects had. In his opinion, the *Kiyor* and its stand were carried on wagons and not by the sons of Kehas on their shoulders.

The definition of the *Kiyor*’s different status, as explained above, helps to elucidate why it was allowed to sink it into a reservoir in the ‘Azarah each night as explained in our *sugya*, even though this apparently invalidated the *mitzvah* of building the Temple, which consisted of the holy objects that were forbidden to be moved (*Chidushei HaGeriz*, 19a). But since the *Kiyor* served only to **prepare** for service in the Temple, its removal from its non-sacred place did not detract from the Temple (*Beer Miryam*, Shemos, *ibid.*).

Indeed, according to Ramban (*ibid.*, 30:19), that the *Kiyor* “is not essential [to the service] and is no *mitzvah*”, there is no *mitzvah* to wash one’s hands and feet only from the *Kiyor* and the *mitzvah* may be performed with any *kli shareis*. Ramban even offers proof for such from the *kohen gadol* who, on Yom Kippur, washed his hands and feet from a golden vessel (Yoma 4:5). On the other hand, Ramban (*Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*, 1:6) lists the *Kiyor* among the objects of the Temple that constitute part of its form and building. Indeed, in his opinion (*Hilchos Bias HaMikdash*, 5:10), as a first preference (*lechatchilah*) it is a *mitzvah* to sanctify one’s hands and feet from the *Kiyor* “but if he sanctified them from another *kli shareis*, he observed the *mitzvah*”. Not only that but in his opinion, our *sugya* does not mention that they sank the *Kiyor* into a reservoir in the ‘Azarah since, as we said, that

would detract from the building of the Temple. Rather, they put it in a round vessel which was the *muchani* according to Rambam (*Beer Miryam*, *ibid.*, and *Torah Sheleimah*, *Miluim on Ki Tisa*, Ch. 4).

We still have the question as to whether, according to Rambam, the *kohen gadol* behaved not *lechatchilah* on Yom Kippur when he washed his hands and feet from a golden vessel. We treat this question in the next article, where we examine the *mitzvah* of sanctification one’s hands and feet.

## DAILY MASHAL

### *Someone Who Sleeps Is Like Someone Who Goes Out*

A *Kohen* who sanctified his hands and feet and left the Temple must re-sanctify them upon his return. Rambam (*Hilchos Bias HaMikdash*, 5:3) adds that a *Kohen* who falls asleep must also sanctify his hands and feet, though he did so before he slept.

The *Sefas Emes* zt”l (in his *chidushim* on our *sugya*) wonders what is his source and replies: When a person sleeps, his soul goes away. What is the difference if his body leaves the Temple or his soul? Both are an interruption.