

17 Iyar 5778
May 2, 2018



Zevachim Daf 19

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

A Bandage for a Kohen

The *Mishna* states there (*in Eiruvין 103b*): If a *Kohen* was wounded in his finger, he can wrap reed-grass on it on *Shabbos* when he is in the Temple (*as it is unseemly for his wound to be exposed during the service*), but not when he is in the city (*for the Rabbis forbade healing in order that people won't grind herbs*). If he intends to squeeze blood out of this wound when doing so, it is forbidden in the Temple as well (*for this act constitutes making a wound, which is Biblically forbidden*).

Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rabbi Chiya says: This is only regarding reed-grass. However, he cannot put a small belt on it because this is as he is wearing an additional garment while he is doing the Temple service (*when the Kohen is only supposed to wear the four priestly vestments*).

Rabbi Yochanan argues: Additional garments are only a concern when the extra garment is being worn on a place where the priestly garments are usually worn. Being that this is on the finger, it is not regarded as an additional garment.

The *Gemora* asks: Why isn't this considered a *chatzitzah* (*interposition*) between his hand and whatever service he is performing? [*He is required to perform the service without having anything between his hand and the items upon which the service is being performed.*]

The *Gemora* answers: The case is where the wound is on his left hand. Alternatively, it is when it is on a place on his right hand that does not touch anything upon which he is performing service.

Rabbi Yochanan argues on Rava, for Rava said in the name of Rav Chisda: If the *chatzitzah* is where the priestly vestments are

worn, even one thread is a *chatzitzah*. If it is not where they are worn, only material of three by three fingerbreadths interposes, less than that does not (*implying that if it is less than that, like a small belt, it is not regarded as an additional garment*).

The *Gemora* observes: This certainly argues on Rabbi Yochanan (*who holds that it is not regarded as an additional garment on a place where the priestly vestments are not usually worn*). Is he arguing on Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rabbi Chiya (*who said that even a small belt will be considered an interposition*)?

The *Gemora* concludes: [*They agree.*] A small belt is a significant article (*as it is made to look nice, and therefore even Rava will agree that it interposes even if it is less than three fingerbreadths*).

There is another version of our *Gemora*. Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rabbi Chiya says: This is only regarding reed-grass. However, he cannot put a small belt on it because this is as he is wearing an additional garment while he is doing the Temple service. Rabbi Yochanan says: If the material is less than three by three fingerbreadths, it is only a *chatzitzah* if it is in a place where the vestments usually are. If it is not in such a place, only a material of three by three fingerbreadths interposes, not less. This is the same opinion as that of Rava in the name of Rav Chisda.

The *Gemora* asks: Let us say that he is arguing on Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rabbi Chiya!

The *Gemora* answers: A small belt is significant, and therefore interposes even according to Rabbi Yochanan.

The *Gemora* asks: According to Rabbi Yochanan, why did the *Mishna* there mention that reed-grass is permitted? It should have taught us that even a belt is permitted!?

The *Gemora* answers: It was teaching us another lesson, namely that reed-grass has healing properties (*for these types of wounds*). (19a)

Interpositions

Rava inquires: If the wind blows the vestment away from the skin of the *Kohen* while he is performing the service, what is the law? Do we say that the garments have to be (*as the verse says*) *on his flesh*, and they are not (*and it is therefore invalid*)? Or do we say that he is wearing them as they are normally worn, and the service is therefore valid?

Is a louse a *chatzitzah*? If it is dead, it is certainly a *chatzitzah*. What is the law if it is alive? Do we say that because it comes and goes, it is like his flesh, and therefore it does not interpose? Or do we say that because he objects to it being there, it is a *chatzitzah*?

Is earth a *chatzitzah*? Certainly earth is a *chatzitzah*! Rather, is the dust of the earth a *chatzitzah*? [*Being that it is so light and he doesn't even feel it, do we say it is insignificant?*] Is the space between the garments and his armpit regarded as a *chatzitzah* (*for it is not lying "on his flesh"*), or do we say that he is wearing them normally and therefore it is valid? If he puts his hand in his pocket, what is the law? Do we say his body (*i.e. hand*) is a *chatzitzah* between his clothes and his body? Is a stray hair a *chatzitzah*? Certainly it is! Rather, the question is whether or not a detached fiber from his clothing is a *chatzitzah* or not. Mar bar Rav Ashi asked: If his hair goes beyond his neck and interposes between the back of his shirt and his neck, is that a *chatzitzah*? Do we say that his hair is like his body or not? (19a)

Kohen Wearing Tefillin

Rabbi Zeira asked: Are *tefillin* a *chatzitzah*? [*Is it regarded as if he is wearing an additional garment?*] According to the opinion that the night is not the time for the *mitzvah* of *tefillin*, it is certainly a *chatzitzah* at night (*and would invalidate any service*

that he performs with them during the night), and so too during the day (*for the avodos performed by day are treated with a greater degree of stringency than the avodos performed by night*). The question is according to the opinion that the night is a time for the *mitzvah* of *tefillin*. Being that this is a *mitzvah* performed with his body, it is regarded as an additional garment, or perhaps not?

This question ended up being presented to Rabbi Ami. He said: It is a well established law that *tefillin* are a *chatzitzah* (*i.e., they are considered an additional garment*).

The *Gemora* challenges this from the following *braisa*: When the *Kohanim* serve, the Levites are singing on the steps of the Temple, and the *Yisroelim* are occupied in their station (*Ma'amados; service corresponding to the daily service of the Temple*), they are exempt from prayer and *tefillin*. This implies that if do they wear them, they would not disqualify the service!

The *Gemora* answers: No, they are a *chatzitzah*.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, why does the *braisa* say that they are exempt? It should have said that they are forbidden from wearing them!?

The *Gemora* answers: Being that the Levites and *Yisroelim* can wear them, it had to say that they are exempt (*and not they are forbidden, which is indeed the law for the Kohanim*).

The *Gemora* asks: Doesn't the *braisa* say that if the *Kohanim* put on *tefillin*, they do not interpose?

The *Gemora* answers: *Tefillin* of the hand interpose, but not *tefillin* of the head.

The *Gemora* asks: Why do the *tefillin* of the hand interpose? It must be because the verse says: *he should wear them on his flesh*, teaching that nothing should separate between his priestly garment and his flesh. This should also be the case regarding his head, as the verse says: *and you will place the turban on his head!*?

The *Gemora* answers from the following *braisa*: His (*the Kohen Gadol's*) hair would stick out from between the *tzitz* (*head-plate*) and his turban, as he would put his *tefillin* there. [*In other words, it is a place where no garment must go, and therefore there is no question of chatzitzah, and it is not regarded as an additional garment.*] (19a – 19b)

Mechusar Kippurim

The *Mishna* had states: A *mechusar kippurim* (*one who was tamei, but has immersed himself in a mikvah, and has waited until nightfall; he is just lacking atonement until he brings his offerings the next day*) invalidates the service.

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

The *Gemora* answers: The verse says: *and the Kohen will atone for her and make her pure*. This implies that she (*a woman who gave birth and needed to bring her sacrifices due to the birth*) was considered *tamei* before she brought her sacrifices. [*Since we have learned previously that a tamei invalidates the service, the same would apply to a mechusar kippurim.*] (19b)

Washing Hands and Feet

The *Mishna* had stated that a *Kohen* who did not wash his hands and feet beforehand invalidates the service.

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

The *Gemora* answers: We know this from a *gezeirah shaveh* of *chukah* from one lacking the proper priestly garments.

The *braisa* states: If a *Kohen Gadol* did not immerse himself or wash his hands and feet between changes of clothes and services (*i.e on Yom Kippur*), his service is still considered valid. However, if a *Kohen Gadol* or an ordinary *Kohen* did not wash their hands and feet in the morning, their service is invalid.

Rav Assi said to Rabbi Yochanan: Let us analyze this. The law that the *Kohen Gadol* on *Yom Kippur* must immerse five times in a *mikvah* and wash his hands and feet ten times is a biblical law,

regarding which the verse says: *it is a law*. Why don't we say that this is required, or the service is invalid?

Rabbi Yochanan answered: The verse says: *And he will wear them*. This implies that as long as he wears the appropriate garments, his service is valid.

Rav Assi's face lit up at having heard such a good reason. However, Rabbi Yochanan then said: I have written for you a letter *vav* that is broken in pieces (*a seemingly straight letter that is in fact broken*). If so, let the washing in the morning have the same law!?

Chizkiyah answered this question. The verse states: *And it will be for them for a law forever for him and his children for generations*. This teaches us that whatever would invalidate the service of an ordinary *Kohen* invalidates the service of a *Kohen Gadol*. If it does not invalidate the service of an ordinary *Kohen*, it does not invalidate the service of the *Kohen Gadol*.

Rabbi Yonasan answers: The verse states: *And Moshe, Aaron, and his sons will wash from it*. This teaches that whatever would invalidate the service of his (*Aaron's*) sons invalidates his service. If it does not invalidate the service of his sons, it does not invalidate his service.

The *Gemora* asks: Why didn't Rabbi Yonasan use the verse advanced by Chizkiyah?

The *Gemora* answers: This is not meant for comparison, but rather a warning to pass this on to his children.

The *Gemora* asks: Why didn't Chizkiyah learn like Rabbi Yonasan?

The *Gemora* answers: He requires this verse for the teaching of Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina. He says: Any *Kiyor* that does not contain enough water to wash Moshe, Aaron, and his sons 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 *braisa* states: How is the *mitzvah* of washing performed? He puts his right hand on his right foot and his left hand on his left foot, and washes them. Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah says: He puts his two hands over each other, and puts them over his legs which are one over the other, and washes them. They said to him: You have gone too far; it is impossible to do this.

The *Gemora* asks: How would he respond to such a good question?

Rav Yosef answers: His friend is allowed to help him.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the crux of their argument?

Abaye answers: The difference is in a case where the *Kohen* is being supported from the side (*the Rabbis hold one must be standing when washing, and this is not called standing*).

Rav Sama the son of Rav Ashi said to Ravina: Why can't he sit?

He answered: The verse states: *To serve*, and serving means doing so while standing.

The *braisa* states: If he washed his hands and feet during the day, he does not have to do so again at night. If he did so at night, he must do so again in the morning. These are the words of Rebbe, as Rebbe used to say that the passing of night nullifies the previous washing. Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Shimon says: It does not nullify the washing.

Another *braisa* states: If he was doing the Temple service the entire night, when daybreak arrives, he must wash his hands and feet again. These are the words of Rebbe. Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Shimon says: Being that he washed before he began the service, he does not even need washing for another ten days.

The *Gemora* explains: Both *braisos* are necessary. If the first one would only be stated, we would think that Rebbe argues because he stopped doing the service. However, if he did not stop, perhaps Rebbe would agree. If only the second one would

be stated, we might think that Rabbi Elozar only says he does not require washing because he does not stop serving. If he did, perhaps he would agree to Rebbe. This is why both *braisos* are necessary.

The *Gemora* asks: What is Rebbe's reasoning?

The *Gemora* answers: The verse states: *When they approach* (implying that when they approach again, for a new set of sacrifices the next day, they need to wash again).

The *Gemora* asks: What is Rabbi Elozar's reasoning?

The *Gemora* answers: The verse states: *When they come* (implying that as long as they are already here, they do not need to wash again).

The *Gemora* asks: What does Rebbe do with the verse, *when they come*?

The *Gemora* answers: If it would only say *when they approach* and not *when they come*, I would say that one must wash for every time he approaches the Altar. This is why it also says *when they come*.

The *Gemora* asks: What does Rabbi Elozar do with *when they approach*?

The *Gemora* answers: If it would only say *when they come*, I would think this means even without doing any service.

The *Gemora* asks: Why would we think this? The verse explicitly states that this is only when they would serve!?

Rather, he requires this verse for the teaching of Rav Acha the son of Rav Yaakov. He says: Everyone agrees that when the *Kohen Gadol* does his second washing of the day on *Yom Kippur*, he does so while dressed. This is as the verse says: *or when they approach*. This implies that he is only lacking the approach to the service, not the approaching and getting dressed. Another verse teaches us that he is required to wash his hands and feet

even for a service which is not essential for atonement. (19b – 20a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Putting Tefillin on a Hat

Our *sugya* treats the prohibition of any *chatzitzah* – interruption, separating between the *bigdei kehunah* and a *Kohen's* flesh, as we are told – “...and trousers of cloth he shall wear on his flesh,” interpreted by *Chazal* in our *sugya* as meaning, “nothing should interfere between it and his flesh.”

Shulchan 'Aruch (O.C. 27:4) rules a similar *halachah* about *tefillin*: “Nothing should interfere between the *tefillin* and his flesh.” However, in the following paragraph Rabbi Yosef Kairo writes that for an ill person who must always cover his head, “we should allow him to place the head *tefillin* on the thin hat closest to his head; and he should cover it lest people see it.” Must *tefillin* be put on one’s skin or is it allowed to put them on a hat? It turns out that these two halachos are a sort of compromise in a difference of opinions among the Rishonim.

Our *Gemora* explains that the *Kohanim* did not don arm *tefillin* during their service in the Temple. They could not put the *tefillin* on their sleeves as the sleeve would be a *chatzitzah* between the *tefillin* and their flesh and they could not put them on under the sleeve as nothing must interrupt between the *bigdei kehunah* and their skin. The *Rosh* (Responsa, *kelal* 3, §4) proves therefrom that *tefillin* should not be put on a hat.

However, the *Rashba* inclines to believe that *chatzitzah* is not pertinent to head *tefillin*. In his opinion, the **arm** *tefillin* should not be put on a garment because of *Chazal's* interpretation “a sign to you and not to others.” In other words, the arm *tefillin* should be under the garment and not on it. On the other hand, this interpretation does not apply to the head *tefillin* and therefore they may be put on a hat (*Magen Avraham* adds that if so, the arm *tefillin* may also be put on a garment if another garment covers them as, according to the *Rashba*, there is no *chatzitzah* in *tefillin* but the arm *tefillin* must be covered).

The two apparently contradictory paragraphs in *Shulchan 'Aruch* are a compromise between the *Rosh's* strict opinion and the *Rashba's* lenient opinion. Therefore, *Shulchan 'Aruch* rules according to the *Rosh*, that “nothing should interfere between the *tefillin* and his flesh.” But a person who cannot put on *tefillin* without *chatzitzah* may rely on the *Rashba*, on condition that people do not see him and learn from his custom (and he should also not pronounce a *berachah* on the head *tefillin*).

It is still not clear as to why a sick person may put *tefillin* only on a thin hat. Is a thin hat less of a *chatzitzah* than a thick one? *Mishnah Berurah* (S.K. 19) explains that the difference does not stem from *chatzitzah* but because a thick hat would interfere with the person’s putting the *tefillin* in their exact position on the head.

DAILY MASHAL

An amazing story is told about the exact observation of *mitzvos* heeded by HaGaon Rav Y.Y. Weiss zt”l, *av beis din* of the *Eidah Chareidis* in *Yerushalayim* and author of *Minchas Yitzchak*. Because of his heart ailment, the doctors left an opening in a vein in his left arm with a small pipe, such that in time of need they could inject him immediately. Rav Weiss did not agree to this *chatzitzah*, though he was bedridden, and every morning he removed the pipe, though this involved loss of blood and excruciating pain. During a senior doctor’s visit, Rav Weiss remarked that the injections could be performed in a different way, not involving *chatzitzah*. The doctor agreed and for a long while told everyone about the “rabbi professor.”