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

The *Gemara* asks why the verse 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 *Gemara* 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. (25a1)

Mishnah

If the blood spilled from the vessel, and the *Kohen* gathered it, the sacrifice remains valid. (25a2)

Blood from the Neck

The *Gemara* cites a *Baraisa*: It is written: *And the anointed Kohen shall take from the blood of the bull*. This teaches us that he should take of the lifeblood, but not of the blood of the skin or of the remnant blood (*that which trickles out before and after the lifeblood*). *Of the blood of the bull* teaches us that he must receive the blood directly from the bull (*and if it spilled from the neck onto the floor, it is invalid – even if he gathers it up*). You cannot think that *from the blood of the bull* is teaching us that even a portion of the blood may be received, for surely Rav said: One who slaughters is required to receive all the blood of the bull, for it is written: *And he shall pour all the blood of the bull*. Therefore *from the blood of the bull* means that, he is t must receive the blood directly from the bull, for this *Tanna* maintains that you subtract, add, and derive. [*We take the "mem" from "midam" and add it to the word "haper" to read, "dam mei'hapar" -- "blood from the bull."*] (25a2)

Rav Yehudah had stated in the name of Rav: One who slaughters is required to receive all the blood of the bull, for it is written: *And he shall pour all the blood of the bull*.

The *Gemara* asks: But surely this is written regarding the remainder of the blood (*which is poured onto the base*

of the Altar; not the receiving of the blood)!?

The *Gemara* answers: Since it is inapplicable to the remainder, for all the blood is not available (*since some of the blood has been applied on the Altar*) apply it to the receiving of the blood.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: One who slaughters must raise the knife upwards (*so the blood from the knife does not drip into the receiving basin*), for it is written: *And he shall take from the blood of the bull*. This implies that he must not take from the blood of the bull plus something else.

The *Gemara* asks: And with what does he wipe the knife (*for it cannot mix with the blood of the next sacrifice*)?

Abaye said: It is done with the edge of the bowl, as it is written: golden bowls (*which, in Aramaic, means "to wipe"*). (25a2 – 25a3)

Rav Chisda said in the name of Rabbi Yirmiyah bar Abba: One who slaughters must place the *veridin* (*jugular veins*) into the (*airspace of the*) vessel (*in order that the lifeblood shall go directly into the vessel*).

The *Gemara* notes that it was stated likewise: Rav Assi said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: The *veridin* must see the air space of the vessel.

Rav Assi inquired of Rabbi Yochanan: What if one was receiving the blood, and the bottom of the basin split open before the blood reached the air space (*of the vessel; is it regarded as if he received the blood in the vessel or not*)? Is an object in the air, where it will not eventually come to rest, regarded as if it rested (*and then the Kohen may gather it from the floor and it will still be valid*), or not?

Rabbi Yochanan replied to him: We have learned it in the following *Mishnah*: If a barrel lies beneath a jet of spring water, the water inside it and outside it (*that which is above it in its airspace*) is unfit (*to be used for the waters of the red heifer; this is because it was not collected in this vessel for the purpose of sanctifying it, and the law is that it must be sanctified for that purpose while it is still running water*). If, however, one joined the barrel's mouth to the jet of water, the water inside it is unfit, and the water outside of it (*still inside the pipe*) is fit (*for it never entered the airspace of the vessel*). [*From the first law of the Baraisa we can learn that anything which is in the airspace of an object is regarded as if it is resting in it.*]

The *Gemara* asks: Now what proof is this? The inquiry was regarding an object in the air, where it will not eventually come to rest, and the attempted resolution was from a case where the object in the air where it will eventually come to rest!?

The *Gemara* answers: There were actually two inquiries: If you will conclude that an object in the air, where it will not eventually come to rest, is not regarded as if it rested, what would be the law regarding an object in the air, where it will eventually come to rest?

That is how Rav Yosef taught the (*above*) discussion. Rav Kahana taught it that he asked him about a barrel (*with regards to the waters of the parah adumah*) and he answered him about a barrel (*from the Baraisa mentioned above*). Rabbah taught it that he had inquired of him about a barrel, and he resolved it for him

from the case of the basin (*where the blood from the sacrifice was going into the airspace of the basin*). He argued as follows: do you not agree that in the case of the basin, is it not unavoidable that the blood will squirt through the airspace into the basin (*and nevertheless, it is regarded as being directly received from the neck of the animal*)? (25a3 – 25b2)

We learned in a *Mishnah*: If one places his hand or foot or (*edible*) vegetables leaves (*into flowing spring water*), in order that the water should flow into the barrel, the water is unfit (*to be used for the parah adumah*). If one placed there leaves of reeds or leaves of walnuts, it is fit. This is the general rule: If the water is directed into the barrel by means of anything which can become *tamei*, it is unfit; but if it is by means of anything which cannot become *tamei*, it is fit. How is this known? It is because Rabbi Yochanan said in the name of Rabbi Yosi bar Abba: It is written: Only a spring or a pit, a gathering of water shall be *tahor*. This teaches us that its existence must be through *taharah*.

Rabbi Chiya said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: This proves that the air space of a vessel is regarded as the vessel itself (*for when the water flows over his hand, it does not fall directly into the barrel but first travels some distance through the air space above the barrel; if that airspace were not regarded as the barrel itself, the water would be regarded as falling from the air into the barrel, not from the hand, and so it would be fit*).

Rabbi Zeira said to Rabbi Chiya bar Abba: Perhaps it refers to a case where the water directly trickled into the barrel?

Rabbi Chiya exclaimed: Fool! The *Mishnah* had explicitly stated that the water shall pass over into the barrel.

Rabbi Chiya said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: The following *Mishnah* was taught based upon the testimony of Rabbi Tzadok. For we learned in a *Mishnah*: Rabbi Tzadok testified that flowing spring water, which he directed with leaves of walnuts are fit. A case occurred in Ohalaya and it came before the *Chachamim* in the Chamber of Hewn Stone and they permitted it. (25b2 – 25b3)

Blemish after the Slaughtering

Rabbi Zeira said in the name of Rebbe (Rabbi Yochanan, according to B"ach): If the *Kohen* nicked the bull's ear (*after it was slaughtered*) and then receives its blood, it is unfit, for it is written: *And the anointed Kohen shall take from the blood of the bull*. This teaches us that he must receive the blood from the bull as it was before (*when it was slaughtered*).

The *Gemara* asks: We have found that this law applies to sacrifices of higher sanctity (*kodshei kodashim*); how do we know that it is applicable for sacrifices of lower sanctity (*kodashim kalim*) as well?

Rava answers that it was taught in the following *Baraisa* (*regarding the pesach offering*): *A lamb, unblemished, a male, within its first year*. This teaches us that it must be without a blemish and a year old when it is slaughtered. How do we know that the same *halachos* apply at the time of the receiving of the blood, the carrying, and the sprinkling? It is because it is written: *it shall be*, which indicates that by all of its beings (*the avodos*), it must be without blemish and a year old.

Abaye asked him from the following *Baraisa*: Rabbi

Yehoshua said: Regarding all sacrifices in the Torah (*that were destroyed*) that as much as an olive's volume of flesh (*which can be eaten*) or fat (*which can be burned on the Altar*) remained, the *Kohen* sprinkles the blood! [*Thus we see that a blemished animal is nevertheless valid!?*]

The *Gemara* answers that the law mentioned above is only applicable to the provision that it must be within its first year.

The *Gemara* asks: Is it possible for it to be within its first year at the time of slaughtering, yet within its second year at the time of carrying and sprinkling?

Rava answered: This proves that hours (*past its year*) can disqualify (*the animal*) in the case of sacrifices. (25b3 – 25b4)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The Age of a Sacrifice: A Cause or an Indication?

The Torah mentions that we mustn't sacrifice a lamb more than one year old. *Chazal* also specify that there are other limitations on age: two years for a ram and three years for a steer (see Parah, Ch. 1).

How should we regard a gigantic one-day-old lamb? An interesting question is commonly asked in *batei midrash*: Are these limitations in age a *sibah* – a cause, i.e. an ultimative requirement, or a *siman* – an indicative feature of the offering? In other words, does the Torah want that a certain sacrifice should be offered within its first year and another be offered not older than three years or does the Torah mean to describe their physical development by means of their age? That is, we must offer a certain sacrifice only with a young and tender animal and the animal answers this definition up to the age of one year while we must offer another sacrifice with an adult animal and at the age of three years it is surely adult. We can also phrase this question in the following manner: How should we regard a fully grown lamb, created with the *Sefer Yetzirah*, if on the day of its creation it appeared to be three years old? Is it regarded as one day old, according to its age, or as an adult, according to its physical appearance?

Indeed, veteran learners of Zevachim are familiar with the clear proof from our *sugya* that the required age of a sacrifice is essential and not a mere indication. After all, our *Gemara* teaches that a lamb slaughtered when less than one year old is disqualified if a year since its birth passed in the duration between its slaughtering and the sprinkling of its blood. It is obvious that once the lamb is slaughtered, its physical development stops but nonetheless it is considered to be one year old. Therefore, the age of a sacrifice is only an amount of time and not a sign of its physical development (regarding the possibility to sacrifice an animal created with *Sefer Yetzirah*, see Vol. 181).

Daily Mashal

In Tiferes Shlomo, Rav Shlomo HaKohen of Radomsk, writes (Parashas Vayera) that when the *Gemara* states that hours (*past its year*) can disqualify (*the animal*) in the case of sacrifices, is also a *remez* (*a hint*) to the levels of the righteous people, who do not rest from their holy work for even a moment during the day; they use the entire twenty-four hour period of the day solely for the sake of Heaven. It is they who sustain the world, and without them, the world could not exist even for a moment.

L'zecher Nishmas HaRav Raphael Dov ben HaRav Yosef Yechezkel Marcus O"H