



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Sitting (cont.)

The Gemara concludes its explanation why one who serves in the Beis HaMikdash while sitting is not liable to death.

### 2) Standing on the floor

A Baraisa is cited that provides the source the kohen must stand on the floor while serving in the Beis HaMikdash.

The reason the Mishnah gave three examples of this halacha is explained.

A Baraisa presents the halachos of one who has one foot on the floor and his second foot on something else.

R' Ami inquires about a kohen serving while standing on a stone of the floor that became loose.

According to a second version the question related to one who stood on the ground after one of the stones was removed.

The question remains unresolved.

### 3) Serving with the left hand

A Baraisa presents the sources for the two opinions in the Mishnah about the permissibility of serving with one's left hand.

R' Shimon's position is challenged.

R' Yehudah suggests an explanation for R' Shimon's position.

Rabba successfully challenges this explanation and Rava offers an alternative explanation.

This explanation is also successfully challenged and Abaye suggests an explanation.

Abaye notes that R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon has a third position regarding the permissibility of using one's left hand to serve in the Beis HaMikdash.

### 4) Use of the right hand

Rabba bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan teaches that when the Torah uses the words אֶצְבֶּעֶיךָ in connection with a kohen the intention is for the use of the right hand.

The Gemara initially thinks that both terms have to appear together to require the right hand.

This approach is rejected and Rava suggests that either term will require the use of the right hand.

Abaye challenges this explanation and the discussion leads to a final understanding of the disagreement between Tanna Kamma and R' Shimon regarding the use of the left hand.

A teaching of Rava is cited and the Gemara explains why his teaching is necessary in addition to the teaching of Rabba bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Various issues regarding the kohen's standing while serving*

ותיבעי ליה כל העזרה כולה

**A** kohen must stand on the floor of the courtyard when he performs any of the services. A Baraisa describes a case where a kohen has one foot on the floor, but the other foot is on a utensil, which is an interposition. The Baraisa rules that as the kohen stands, if with the removal of the utensil the kohen would still be able to stand on his one foot which is properly on the surface of the courtyard, his service is kosher. But, if the removal of the utensil would cause the kohen to fall over, his service is not valid.

Regarding this law, R' Ami asked what the halacha would be if one of the stone slabs which form the floor of the courtyard had been removed, and the kohen is standing in the courtyard in the hole where the slab used to sit. The Gemara suggests that his question is how to understand how the area of the Mikdash was sanctified. Did King David sanctify the floor, and not the ground underneath it, or did he sanctify the general area, including the depths below the stone slabs?

The Gemara immediately realizes that if this was the nature of R' Ami's question, he should not have expressed his question in a case where one slab was missing, but regarding the entire floor. Chazon Ish explains that it is common for the Gemara to express its questions using examples which are ordinary. Therefore, we should expect the question to be illustrated where the kohen is standing where one stone was missing, rather than where the entire floor of the courtyard was removed. Yet, the question should have been in general, regarding the sanctification of King David and how it was done, and whether it is the floor of the courtyard or the ground which is sanctified. Therefore, the Gemara concludes that it is obvious that the entire ground is sanctified, and the question of R' Ami is whether a

*(Continued on page 2)*

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Is it permitted for a kohen to perform the service on a loose stone?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. What is the basis of the dispute between Tanna Kamma and R' Shimon?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. What words indicate that the kohen must use his right hand?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. According to R' Shimon, why does the Torah use the term כהן in the context of receiving the blood?  
\_\_\_\_\_

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Washing hands while wearing a bandage

לא יהא דבר חוצץ בינו לבין הכלי

There should be nothing that interposes between the kohen and the vessel

Rav Menashe Klein<sup>1</sup>, author of Teshuvos Mishnah Halachos, was asked whether a band-aid is considered a *chatzitzta* – an interposition when washing one’s hand for bread. In his response he noted that there is a dispute between Rambam and Ra’avad about a kohen who has a bandage or reed on his hand while performing the service of the Beis HaMikdash. Rambam maintains that anything on the kohen’s hand constitutes an interposition and invalidates the service. Ra’avad holds that if the extra material is on a part of the body that is not covered by a garment and it is less than three fingers by three fingers it is not considered an interposition. Seemingly one could apply this dispute to our question and conclude that according to Rambam one may not wash his hands while wearing a bandage whereas according to Ra’avad it would be allowed.

Mishnah Halachos proceeds to cite Sefer Even Ha’azel who distinguishes between two categories of interpositions. One category is the interposition between the kohen’s body and the priestly garments. The second category is the interposition between the kohen’s hand and the sacred vessel that he is required to hold. The first category is derived from the words, *ילבש על בשרו* – He will wear it on his body, and it teaches that the garment must be in direct contact with the kohen’s body and even one hair constitutes an interposition. The second category is derived from the words *ולקח הכהן* – and the kohen took, and it teaches that the kohen must take the vessel in his hand. Following this distinc-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

kohen standing in a hole in the courtyard is conducting himself in a proper manner or not. Is this the way the service is performed or not? The Gemara leaves this question unresolved.

We note that the Gemara has resolved several issues. It is prohibited for there to be any interposition between the feet of the kohen and the floor of the courtyard of the Mikdash. If he performs a service while standing on a utensil, on an animal, or even on his friend’s foot, the service is not valid. If one of the kohen’s feet is on a foreign object, his service is still valid only if he would remain standing when that object would be removed. R’ Ami holds that if the kohen stands upon a slab which has become dislodged, the service is certainly not valid if the slab is not planned to be refastened. If the stone will be refastened, the Gemara leaves it unresolved whether the service of the kohen is valid. If the kohen stands on the ground where the entire floor was missing, the service is valid. Where one slab was missing, and the kohen stands in that spot, the issue is unresolved. ■

tion we would conclude that the laws of interposition that apply when washing one’s hands will be similar to the first category. As such it is likely that even Ra’avad would agree that any interposition would invalidate the washing since Ra’avad’s comments were made in reference to the second category of interpositions that relate to the obligation to take something in one’s hand. In his conclusion, however, he writes that the question of whether a bandage will constitute an interposition will be a function of whether a person is *makpid* – particular, and since people generally want the bandage to remain in place he holds that it would not constitute an interposition when washing. ■

1. שו"ת משנה הלכות ח"ח סי' י"ט. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The Detached Stone

"נדלדלה האבן ועמד עליה מהו..."

Rav Eliyahu Lopian, zt"l, gave a very powerful illustration of the vast difference between two people who do the same action with very different attitudes. "You may have two people who have fallen into the same negative behavior. One bitterly regrets his evil deeds, while the other is completely unrepentant. He reasons that he should not be a hypocrite. Although the one with regrets may well be one of the notorious 'wicked who are filled with regrets,' nevertheless, the difference between him and his unrepentant friend is

like the difference between heaven and earth. The one who regrets is way ahead of the one who is unrepentant."<sup>1</sup>

The Sifsei Tzaddik of Piltz, zt"l, learns a similar lesson from today’s daf. "When the verse tells us to write the Torah on stone, we can understand this to mean that even if one’s heart is as hard as stone, the Torah will heal him. As our sages teach, even if one’s heart is stone, it will melt through Torah study.

"The holy works explain that one’s heart is the main dwelling place of Hashem, since the main place of *dveikus* is in one’s heart. In this vein we can explain the verse, 'והארץ הדום רגלי' —And the earth is My footstool' – to refer to the hearts of the Jewish people which are likened to the floor of the mikdash, since

Hashem dwells within our hearts. Now we can understand the Gemara in Zevachim 24. The Gemara discusses the case of a kohen who performed the *avodah* while standing on a stone of the floor of the mikdash that was detached. The Gemara concludes that if he does not plan on reattaching it, it may be *chotzet*, but if he plans on reattaching it, it is considered part of the floor and is not an impediment. Similarly, when a Jewish heart slips away from Hashem enough that he falls to sin, this is like a stone in the mikdash that has slid out of place. This Jew must feel faint from falling away—or at least yearn to reattach to his Source!"<sup>2</sup> ■

1. לב אליהו עה"ת

2. שפתי צדיק—פילץ, ח"ה, ע"י קכ"ח ■

