

22 Iyar 5778
May 7, 2018



Zevachim Daf 24

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

No Separation

The *Mishna* stated that if one performed the service while standing on vessels, an animal, or someone else’s feet, it is invalid. The *Tanna* from the Academy of Rabbi Yishmael explains that the floor of the Courtyard is sanctified, as the *Kohanim* stand on it for the service, and the *klai sharais - vessels for the service* also are sanctified, as they were anointed with *shemen hamishchah – the oil of anointing*. Just as there may not be any separation between the *Kohen* and the vessels, so there may not be any separation between the *Kohen* and the floor.

The *Gemora* explains that the *Mishna* had to list all three cases of separation between the *Kohen* and the floor. If it just listed a vessel, we may have thought that only a vessel is a separation, as it is totally unrelated to the *Kohen’s* foot, but an animal, which is also flesh like the *Kohen’s* foot, may not be a separation. The *Mishna* therefore listed an animal as a separation as well. We still may have thought that an animal is a separation because it is not human flesh, but another person’s foot is not a separation, so the *Mishna* then had to teach us that even another person’s foot is a separation. (24a)

Feet on the Ground

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*, in which Rabbi Eliezer says that if the *Kohen* had one foot on the floor, and one on a vessel or a stone, the service is valid only if he could stand on his remaining foot if the vessel or stone were removed.

Rabbi Ami asks as to what would be the rule if he stood on a stone of the floor that became loose. The *Gemora* explains that if he has no intention of reattaching the stone, it is clearly considered a separation, but the question is when he plans to reattach it, and Rabbi Ami is asking whether we consider it already attached due to his intention.

Rabbah Zuti learned that Rabbi Ami’s question was when a stone was removed, and the *Kohen* stood in resulting open spot. The *Gemora* suggests that the question is whether Dovid sanctified the Courtyard all the way to the depths, or only at the top floor level, but the *Gemora* rejects this, since we could then ask the same question throughout the Courtyard.

Instead, we assume Dovid sanctified it all the way to the depths, but the question is whether serving on one spot of bare earth is considered appropriate service or not. The *Gemora* leaves Rabbi Ami’s question unresolved. (24a)

Right Hand Only?

The *Mishna* stated that if the *Kohen* received the blood with his left hand, it is invalid, but Rabbi Shimon says it is valid.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* about this dispute. The verse says that the *Kohen* will “take from the chatas blood with his finger, and put it on the corners of the Altar.” The *braisa* says that the use of word “finger” adjacent to “take” (i.e., receiving the blood) and “put” (i.e., applying the blood) teaches that both must be done with the right hand. Any time the verse uses “finger” it implies the right one, since we learn

them from a *gezeirah shavah* - same words from the words used in the context of *metzora*, where the right finger and hand are explicitly stated. Rabbi Shimon says that the word "hand" is not used in describing the application, while the word "finger" only applies to the "put" phrase, so it is valid if the *Kohen* received the blood with his left hand.

The *Gemora* tries to determine if Rabbi Shimon accepts the *gezeirah shavah* from *metzora* that the word "hand" and "finger" are learned from *metzora* to imply right. Since Rabbi Shimon objects that the verse does not use the word "hand," indicating that he would have agreed that receiving the blood would have to be with the right hand, this implies that he accepts it. However, if he does, then why does he not apply the *gezeirah shavah* to the word "finger," necessitating the right for both actions mentioned in this verse – receiving and accepting?

Rav Yehudah suggests that Rabbi Shimon does not accept the *gezeirah shavah*, and he is only saying that if the verse had explicitly said *right* hand, it would have necessitated the right hand for receiving.

Rabbah objects, on two counts:

1. Why does he accept that applying the blood must be with the right hand, as the word "finger" would only imply "right" due to the *gezeirah shavah*?
2. Rabbi Shimon explicitly says in a *braisa* that any time the verse uses the word "hand" or "finger" it implies right, which is the principle of the *gezeirah shavah*.

Rava says that Rabbi Shimon accepts the *gezeirah shavah*, but is stating that the word "finger" cannot apply to receiving blood, as that is done with a full hand, and not just one finger.

Rav Sama the son of Rav Ashi challenged this answer to Ravina, as one can make a handle for the vessel that receives the blood, and hold the vessel with one finger.

Abaye says the dispute in the *braisa* is not the *gezeirah*

shavah, but how to apply the word "finger," which is in between two phrases. The Sages say that the word is applied to both the phrase before ("take" - receive) and after ("put" - apply), while Rabbi Shimon says it is only applied to the phrase after.

Abaye says that Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Shimon hold another opinion, distinct from Rabbi Shimon's (his father), and from the Sages'. The *braisa* cites Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Shimon saying that the word "finger" only invalidates what it is directly referring to. Therefore, if the verse uses the word "finger" relating to receiving the blood, it is invalidated only if the *Kohen* receives incorrectly, and if the verse uses the word "finger" relating to applying the blood, it is invalidated only if he applies it incorrectly.

The *braisa* explains that the verse about the *miluim* – inauguration sacrifices is one that applies "finger" only to application, since it says "you should take from the blood of the ox, and put it on the horns of the altar with your finger."

Abaye explains that the verse cited in the earlier *braisa* is one that Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Shimon classifies as having the word "finger" refer only to receiving the blood, as he applies the word to only the phrase directly preceding it, and not to any phrase further preceding it, or following it. (24a – 24b)

Finger + Kohen = Right?

Rabbah bar bar Chanah quotes Rabbi Yochanan saying that anytime the verse uses the term "finger" and "*Kohen*," it must be done with the right hand.

The *Gemora* first assumes that both terms must be present to require the right, as the verse about the *chatas* uses both – and the *Kohen* will take from the *chatas* blood *with his finger* – and we learn that verse from the verse about a *metzora*, which explicitly refers to the right finger.

The *Gemora* challenges this, since *kemitzah* – scooping the *minchah* only mentions “*Kohen*,” yet the *Mishna* states that if a *Kohen* did it with his left hand it is invalid.

Therefore, Rava says that Rabbi Yochanan means any verse that uses either term implies the right. Abaye challenges this, since bringing the limbs of the sacrifice to the ramp of the Altar mentions “*Kohen*,” but parts of the sacrifice were brought in the *Kohen*’s left hand.

The *Gemora* answers that Rabbi Yochanan is only referring to actions which are necessary for atonement of the sacrifices, similar to the actions specified in the context of the *metzora*.

The *Gemora* objects that receiving the blood mentions “*Kohen*,” and is necessary for atonement, yet Rabbi Shimon says that the sacrifice is valid, even if the blood is received with the left hand.

The *Gemora* answers that Rabbi Shimon requires both phrases, but Rabbi Yochanan is referring to the Sages’ position.

The *Gemora* objects, since Rabbi Shimon says in a *braisa* that any verse specifying “finger” or “hand” requires right, without mentioning the word “*Kohen*.”

The *Gemora* answers that Rabbi Shimon’s position is that “finger” or “hand” on their own imply right, but “*Kohen*” only teaches that the *Kohen* must wear his priestly garments.

The *Gemora* challenges that applying the blood only mentions “*Kohen*,” yet the *Mishna* states that the sacrifice is invalid if the blood was applied with the left hand, and Rabbi Shimon does not disagree.

Abaye says that Rabbi Shimon does disagree in a *braisa*.

The *Gemora* cites Rava, who lists the phrases used in *metzora*, and what we learn must be done with the right:

Phrase	Applies “right” to...
<i>Yad</i> – hand	<i>Kemitzah</i> – scooping the <i>minchah</i>
<i>Regel</i> – foot	<i>Chalitzah</i> – removing the shoe when <i>yibum</i> is not done
<i>Ozen</i> – ear	<i>Retzia</i> – piercing the ear of the slave

The *Gemora* asks why we need to learn from *metzora* that *kemitzah* be done with the right hand, as it already mentions “*Kohen*.”

The *Gemora* answers that one verse teaches that the *kemitzah* itself must be done with the right hand, and another verse teaches that sanctifying the *kemitzah*, by placing it in a sanctified vessel, must be done with vessel in the *Kohen*’s right hand.

The *Gemora* asks why it is necessary according to Rabbi Shimon. Although Rabbi Shimon does not require right due to the presence of the word “*Kohen*,” Rabbi Shimon either does not require sanctifying the *kemitzah*, or allows it to be done with the left hand, so the verse cannot apply to sanctifying the *kometz*. It also cannot apply to *kemitzah* itself, since Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rabbi Chiya says that Rabbi Shimon learns that *kemitzah* must be done with the right hand from the verse which says that the *minchah* is like a *chatas* and an *asham*. The verse is teaching that if the *Kohen* chooses to sacrifice the *minchah* with his hand, he must do so with his right hand, like the *chatas*, while if he chooses to do it in a vessel, he can do it with his left, like an *asham*. From this verse we can also learn that since the *kemitzah* is done by hand, it must be done with the right.

The *Gemora* answers that the verse from *metzora* teaches that even *kemitzah* of the *minchah* offered for a transgression must be done with the right hand. Since Rabbi Shimon says that such a *minchah* is not supposed to be too beautiful (*and*



therefore has no oil or levonah spice) we may have thought that it is valid even if the *kemitzah* was done with the left hand. The verse therefore teaches that even such a *minchah* is invalid if the *kemitzah* is done with the left hand. (24b – 25a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Taking Directly or Indirectly?

The *Tanna* of the Academy of Rabbi Yishmael says that just as there is no separation between the *Kohen* and the *klai shares* – vessels of service, so there may not be separation between the *Kohen* and the floor.

Tosfos (24a ho'eel) suggests that the vessels mentioned here refer to the garments of the *Kohen*, and we know that there may be no separation since the verse specifies that the vessels must be worn directly.

Tosfos also cites Rashi, who explains these vessels to refer to the vessels used for the service (e.g., containers for receiving the blood), and we know that there may not be any separation since the verse states “the *Kohen* will take”, implying that he must directly take the vessel.

Similarly, the *Gemora* in Pesachim (57a) censures Yisachar from Barkai, a *Kohen* who wrapped his hands with cloth when doing the service, implying that there may not be any separation between the *Kohen* and the vessel.

Tosfos notes that when discussing the requirement to take the four species, which the verse also mandates with the verb “take,” the *Gemora* in Sukkah (37a) states that taking through something else is still considered “taking.”

Tosfos distinguishes between two different types of barriers. When the item to be taken is put in a (respectable) handle, this is still considered “taking” the item, and this is what the

Gemora in Sukkah is referring to. However, when the separation is external to the item, and not serving the item, it is a separation, and is not consistent with the requirement to “take.” Therefore, wrapping something on one’s hand is a separation inconsistent with “taking” an item.

Tosfos (Yoma 58a Min) cites the Ritzva, who says that only for purposes of service by the *Kohen*, where the verse explicitly states the subject who will take (the *Kohen* will take), is it necessary that there be no separation whatsoever between the person taking and the item taken. However, in the case of the four species, there is no explicit mention of the person taking, and therefore taking the *lulav* through something else is valid. See Tur and Bais Yosef OH 651 for a more detailed discussion of the parameters of what constitutes a separation for the purposes of the four species.

Who built the Western Wall?

According to our *sugya*, a *Kohen* must stand on the floor of the *Azarah* during his service in the Temple and nothing must interfere between his body and the floor. As a result, our *Gemora* treats the sanctity of the floor of the *Azarah* and discusses whether David sanctified only the stone floor or also the ground and the hollows beneath it. Rav Ami asks about a *Kohen* who must stand on the ground of the *Azarah* because a stone in the floor was removed. The *Gemora* recounts that once David bought the Temple Mount from Aravnah the Jebusite (see Shemuel II, 24 and Divrei HaYamim I, 21-22), he sanctified the ground of the *Azarah* all the way down.

It is allowed to enter the tunnels under the Temple Mount:

The Temple Mount and its environs contain many underground tunnels. *Minchahs Chinuch* (mitzvah 362, os 3) proves that the tunnels **under the Temple Mount** were not sanctified and therefore even the impure, who may not enter the Temple Mount, may enter those tunnels. Still, it is **forbidden** to enter the tunnels under the *Azarah* as David sanctified the ground under the *Azarah* all the way down,

including the tunnels (according to Tosfos, Pesachim 67b, s.v. *Mechilos*).

The sign discovered in the depths of the Temple Mount: In his Responsa *Tzitz Eli'ezer* (X, 1, os 86), HaGaon E.Y. Waldenberg recounts that many years ago the Gaon of Kalish zt"l, author of *Imrei Binah*, was invited to enter the tunnels discovered around the Temple Mount. They came upon a gigantic hall with four entrances, each entrance leading to a similar hall with four entrances and so on. They suddenly discovered a sign in Hebrew saying, "Till here you can come" – in other words, this place is under the *'Azarah* and since we are impure, we must not enter (and see Keilim 1:8).

It is interesting to mention that HaGaon Rav C. Alfandari zt"l (in *Derech HaKodesh* at the end of his *Magid Meireishis*) explains our *Gemora* differently. In his opinion, David did not sanctify the *Azarah* all the way down but only the places needed by the *Azarah*, such as the ground described in our *sugya* if a stone of the floor was removed. But *Minchas Chinuch*, as we said, relies on the Rishonim.

Why did David sanctify the ground of the Temple? Why did David have to sanctify the ground of the Temple Mount? After all, Shlomo actually built the Temple. David, however, built the **foundations** of the Temple and therefore sanctified its ground (*Midrash Shir HaShirim*, 1:6, and see Responsa *Rav Pe'alim*, II, O.C. 21; *Chazon Yechezkel*, Sanhedrin 3:2; *Har HaKodesh*, pp. 40-41).

David built the Western Wall. Speaking about the foundations built by King David, we cannot ignore the foundation that is most important to us: the Western Wall. The wall we now see consists of different layers. The stones of the first five rows are 1.25 meters high and were erected by David. The four layers above them, which are smoother, were built in the Second Temple era and other layers were added later. Archaeologists have discovered that the stones above David's layer were destroyed and rebuilt but that David's layer was never destroyed (see *'Ir HaKodesh*

VehaMikdash by HaGaon Rav Y.M. Tikotchinski zt"l, IV, Ch. 2, os 3). Many Midrashim (*Shemos Rabah*, parashah 1:1; Bemidbar 11:3; Shir HaShirim 2:22; *Eichah Rabah*, 1:32; Zohar, II, 5b) say that the Western Wall will never be destroyed and that the Shechinah has never departed from there. The *Bach* (*Tur*, O.C. 561) found in "*likutim*" that the reason for such is that it was built by King David.

Though some *halachic* authorities doubted whether the Western Wall is the foundation of the wall of the **Temple Mount** and claimed that it is the foundation of the wall of the **Azarah**, most *poskim* don't agree, especially considering the clear archaeological finds. (See at length in *Avnei Nezer*, Y.D. 450-51; *Tevuos HaAretz*, p. 156; *Avodah Tamah*, 15; Rabbi Tzadok HaKohen of Lublin – Responsa *Tiferes Tzevi*, Y.D. 27, os 12, *Derishas Tzevi*; *'Ir HaKodesh VehaMikdash*, *ibid.*; Maharil Diskin, Garshaz of Lublin, the *Aderes* cited in *Mishkenos Leavi Ya'akov*, II, os 1; *Ma'asai Lamelech*, end of Ch. 8 on *Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*; Chazon Ish in *Ma'aseh Ish*, p. 41, in the name of HaGaon Rav C. Kanievski; *Har HaKodesh*, p. 41).

DAILY MASHAL

Don't Tighten the Belt

An argument between a customer and a tailor, who eventually swore an oath, brought the *Ben Ish Chai* to derive a halachah from our *sugya*. A tailor who made a garment for a client aroused his wrath when the latter found that it got caught on thorns because of it was too long. The mutual accusations brought the tailor to swear that he "won't do this garment," meaning that he wouldn't make a hem to shorten it. The poor client tried to shorten the garment by tightening it with his belt. The tailor was about to help him when he suddenly remembered that he might break his oath by doing so. The *Ben Ish Chai* (in Responsa *Torah Lishmah*, 232) justified the tailor's scruples: Shortening a garment with a belt is like cutting it, as our *sugya* says: "long trousers held up by an *avneit* are qualified because an *avnet* cuts." Though the tailor meant making a hem, the severity of an oath prevents him from fixing the garment in any way and the shortening



was left to the client.