

21 Iyar 5778
May 6, 2018



Zevachim Daf 23

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

Elders of the South

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*).

The *Gemora* asks: But a Scriptural verse teaches us that the *pesach* offering is only slaughtered for people who may eat from it?

The *Gemora* answers: The verse teaches us that it is a *mitzvah* to slaughter the *pesach* offering only for people who may eat from it (*however, it is valid after the fact*).

The *Gemora* asks: But the following *braisa* teaches us that it is essential: It is written: *According to the number of people*. This teaches us that the *pesach* offering is slaughtered only for those people who are registered for it. One might think that if it was slaughtered for those who were not registered for it, it should be regarded as one who violates the *mitzvah*, yet it is nevertheless valid. Therefore it is written: *You shall count*. It is reiterated to teach us that it is essential. And the *halachah* pertaining to those who eat from the *pesach* offering are compared to the registrants (*and therefore it should be essential to slaughter only for the people who may eat from it*)!?

The *Gemora* answers: The Elders of the South do not compare them.

The *Gemora* asks: Yet even if they do not compare them, there is still the same refutation (*as to their opinion that 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*): If a person from the outset 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 from the outset send his *pesach* offering to be slaughtered, is it not reasonable to say that the *Kohen*, who is *tamei* from a corpse, should certainly not have the ability to effect acceptance with his service!? [They do not answer this challenge.]

The *Gemora* now asks from the following *Mishna* on the response from the Elders of the South (when they said that one who is *tamei* from a corpse can also send his offerings to be slaughtered): [If the blood of a *pesach* offering was sprinkled, and then it became known that the blood was *tamei*, the *tzitz* provides acceptance; however, if the “body” was *tamei*, the *tzitz* does not provide acceptance] because they said: In the case of a *nazir* and one who sacrifices the *pesach* offering, the *tzitz* provides acceptance for the *tumah* of the blood, but the *tzitz* does not provide acceptance for the *tumah* of the person. [Since the *Mishna* mentioned only these two cases, we assume that the one whose “body” was found to be *tamei* was the body of the owner, not the body of the *Kohen* serving.] With what was the person *tamei*? You (the Elders of the South) cannot understand it to mean that he became *tamei* through contact with a *sheretz*, for surely you maintain that we do slaughter or sprinkle the blood of the *pesach* offering for one who is *tamei* from a *sheretz*. It therefore must be referring to one who became *tamei* by a corpse, yet the *Mishna* teaches that the *tzitz* does not provide acceptance for the *tumah* of the person, which proves that if the owners became *tamei*, they cannot send their sacrifices!?

The *Gemora* answers: The *Mishna* is not dealing with cases where the owners became *tamei*; rather, it is discussing cases where the *Kohen* serving became *tamei* by a *sheretz*.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, let us consider the last clause of that *Mishna*: If he was *tamei* from “*tumas tehom*” (a *tumah* of the deep; a *tumah* source, that in all likelihood, nobody knew about it; there is a tradition that in certain cases, we treat this *tumah* leniently) the *tzitz* does not provide acceptance. [And

according to you, this is also referring to *tumah* from a *sheretz*.] But surely Rabbi Chiya taught: And “*tumah* of the deep” was only said with respect to a corpse. This is evidently excluding “*tumah* of the deep” caused by a *sheretz*!?

The *Gemora* answers that it excludes the “*tumah* of the deep” of *zivah* (a man who has an emission similar but not identical to a seminal discharge).

The *Gemora* asks: But Rami bar Chama inquired: As to the *Kohen* who provides acceptance with their sacrifices, is the “*tumah* of the deep” permitted to him, or is the “*tumah* of the deep” not permitted to him? But according to you (the Elders of the South) it may be resolved that the “*tumah* of the deep” is permitted to him, for here we are discussing here the *tumah* of the *Kohen*!?

The *Gemora* answers: Rami bar Chama certainly disagrees with the Elders of the South.

[Accordingly, it can be proven that Rami bar Chama understands the *Mishna* to be referring to a case where the owner’s body was *tamei*. It must therefore be that he maintains that a *pesach* offering is invalid if it was brought for someone who was *tamei* from a corpse.] The *Gemora* challenges his opinion from the following *braisa*: Regarding the *tzitz* it is said: it shall be on Aaron’s forehead, so that Aaron shall bear a sin of the sacred offerings. This teaches that if the service of an offering is done in a prohibited fashion, the *tzitz* will atone for the sin and the sacrifice is then acceptable. What sin are we referring to? It cannot be referring to the sin of *piggul* (where the one performing the blood service of a sacrifice intended that the sacrifice be consumed outside its prescribed location; this means that he intended to either apply the blood or burn a part of a sacrifice outside the Courtyard, or to eat the gift portion outside the permitted area), for regarding a sacrifice that has the deficiency of *piggul* it is said: it shall not be accepted, and this teaches that the sacrifice is invalid. The *tzitz* also does not atone for *nossar* (a sacrifice where the *Kohen* intended while



performing the blood service that it be consumed beyond the allotted time), for regarding *nossar* it is said: *it shall not be considered*, which teaches us that this sacrifice is invalid. The sin referred to here is the sin of *tumah*, which has an exception that it is permitted if the community is *tamei*.

Now, what type of *tumah* are we referring to here? It cannot be *tumah* from a *sheretz*, for there is no exception where that *tumah* is waived for the public. It must be referring to a case of *tumah* from a corpse, and is it not in reference to a case where the owners became *tamei* through a corpse?! This proves that the *tzitz* does provide acceptance for the *pesach* offering that is brought for someone who was *tamei* from a corpse!?

The *Gemora* answers: In truth, the *braisa* is referring to the *tumah* of a *sheretz*, and when it says that there is an exception, it meant that there is an exception regarding the general category of *tumah*.

The *Gemora* cites another version which supports Rami bar Chama and is a challenge to the Elders of the South: Regarding the *tzitz* it is said: *it shall be on Aaron's forehead, so that Aaron shall bear a sin of the sacred offerings*. This teaches that if the service of an offering is done in a prohibited fashion, the *tzitz* will atone for the sin and the sacrifice is then acceptable, but it will not provide acceptance for the sin of those who consecrated the offerings. Now, what type of *tumah* are we referring to here? It cannot be *tumah* from a *sheretz*, for there is no exception where that *tumah* is waived for the public. It must be referring to a case of *tumah* from a corpse, and in reference to this, it provides atonement for the offerings but not for those who consecrated the offerings. [This challenges the opinion of the Elders of the South who maintain that the *tzitz* does provide acceptance for the *pesach* offering that is brought for someone who was *tamei* from a corpse or for the *Kohen* who performed the service while being *tamei* from a corpse!?!]

The *Gemora* answers: In truth, the *braisa* is referring to the *tumah* of a *sheretz*, and when it says that there is an exception, it meant that there is an exception regarding the general category of *tumah*. (23b – 24A)

DAILY MASHAL

The Tzitz Atones

The *Gemora* states that the *tzitz* would atone for the sins regarding offerings in the Bais HaMikdash. What was the significance of the *tzitz* that it atoned for these sins?

The *tzitz* was placed on the forehead of the *Kohen Gadol*, and the head is the source of the intellect. We find that a *Korban Olah* was brought for the sin of arrogance, where one conjures up thoughts of grandeur and selfishness. One who offered a sacrifice demonstrated humility of spirit, and if there was a deficiency in the sacrifice, this was reflected in his lack of sincerity or in his desire to gain atonement. The *Kohen Gadol*, who represented the Jewish Nation, would don the Holy Vestments, and these vestments contained the power to compensate for the lack of desire and intent in the person offering the sacrifice. Thus, the *tzitz*, worn on the forehead of the *Kohen Gadol*, would compensate for the lack of sincerity and intent on the part of the one offering a sacrifice that was brought for arrogance or selfishness.