



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Zevachim, Daf ל' – Daf ט'

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
vl'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf ל'---13-----

#### MISHNA

- If a Pesach or chatas was shechted not lishma, or if their kabbalah, holacha, or zrika was done not lishma, or if they were done lishma and not lishma, or if they were done not lishma and lishma, they are passul.
  - What is the case of lishma and not lishma? If he began the avodah for the sake of a Pesach and continued for the sake of a shelamim.
  - What is the case of not lishma and lishma? If he began the avodah for the sake of a shelamim and continued for the sake of a Pesach.
  - This is because a korbon can become passul during any one of four things: the shechita, kabbalah, holacha, and zrika.
  - **R' Shimon** says, that an intent of not lishma during the holacha does not make the korbon passul. He would say this is because a korbon cannot be done without shechita, kabbalah, and zrika, but could be done without holacha if it is shechted at the side of the Mizbe'ach.
  - **R' Eliezer** said, if the Kohen was walking in the place that he was supposed to walk to carry the blood, an improper intent can make the korbon passul. However, if he was walking in a place where he didn't have to walk and had an improper intent, it would not make the korbon passul.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** Will an improper intent during the kabbalah make the korbon passul? A Braisa tells of a conversation between **R' Tarfon** and **R' Akiva**, where, among other things, **R' Akiva** said that improper intent during kabbalah does *not* make the korbon passul! **A:** **Rava** said, the Braisa is referring to the intent of piggul, and our Mishna is referring to an intent of not lishma. This can be proven from the fact that the Mishna says "a korbon becomes passul" and doesn't say "a korbon becomes piggul".
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that an intent of piggul only applies when it was had during the four blood avodos, but not during the pouring of the extra blood onto the side of the Mizbe'ach or during the burning of the pieces of the animal on the Mizbe'ach. The Braisa says, that an intent for piggul during the kabbalah *does* make the korbon into piggul! **A:** The first Braisa refers to where the shechita was done with intent to do the kabbalah after its allowable time (that does not create piggul) and the second Braisa refers to where the kabbalah was done with intent to pour the blood on the Mizbe'ach after its allowable time (that does create piggul).
    - **Q:** One of the **Rabanan** asked **Rava**, does piggul not apply to the pouring of the blood on the side of the Mizbe'ach or the burning of the pieces of the animal? A Braisa says that the pasuk of "V'ihm hei'achol yei'acheil" teaches that piggul applies to two types of eating – the eating of a person and the "eating" of the Mizbe'ach! **A:** This Braisa refers to a case where one does zrika with the intent to pour the extra blood onto the side of the Mizbe'ach after the allowable time (which makes piggul). The earlier Braisa refers to where he pours the extra blood onto the side of the Mizbe'ach with the intent to burn the pieces of the animal on the Mizbe'ach after the allowable time. That does not create piggul.
- **R' Yehuda the son of R' Chiya** said, I have heard that if the Kohen dips his finger into the blood (which he must do for a chatas which is offered on the inside Mizbe'ach) with piggul intent, it makes the korbon into piggul.
  - **Ilfa** heard this and repeated it to **Bar Pada**, who said that piggul is learned from a korbon shelamim. Therefore, just as regarding a korbon shelamim the dipping of the Kohen's finger will not make it piggul, so too for a chatas the dipping of his finger will not make it piggul.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Gemara says this is not correct. We don't learn all the laws of piggul from shelamim. For example, piggul only comes about when the piggul intent was the only reason to make the korbon passul. When a chatas is offered not lishma *and* with piggul intent, it does not become piggul. This is true even though if a shelamim is offered not lishma and with piggul intent, it will become piggul (because the shelamim does not become passul from being offered not lishma)! Rather, the laws of piggul for other korbanos are learned from extra words in the pesukim.
- **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said that he heard that the dipping of the Kohen's finger into the blood with piggul intent does make the korbon into piggul.
  - **Reish Lakish** asked, that piggul is learned from a korbon shelamim. Therefore, just as regarding a korbon shelamim the dipping of the Kohen's finger will not make it piggul, so too for a chatas the dipping of his finger will not make it piggul.
    - The Gemara says this is not correct. We don't learn all the laws of piggul from shelamim. For example, piggul only comes about when the piggul intent was the only reason to make the korbon passul. When a chatas is offered not lishma *and* with piggul intent, it does not become piggul. This is true even though if a shelamim is offered not lishma and with piggul intent, it will become piggul (because the shelamim does not become passul from being offered not lishma)!
    - **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said, in fact we do learn all of piggul from shelamim. The fact that chatas does not become piggul with piggul intent when the korbon is offered not lishma is only because that is a psul only for chatas, and not for shelamim. However, a psul that applies to shelamim would prevent the shelamim from becoming piggul even if there was piggul intent!
    - **R' Yirmiya** said, it all depends on what is essential to make the korbon valid – piggul intent during that avoda would make it piggul. Therefore, although the dipping of the finger into the blood of a shelamim with piggul intent would not make the shelamim piggul, that is because the dipping of the finger is not an essential avodah for a shelamim. However, since for a chatas offered inside that is an essential avodah, piggul intent during that act will make the korbon into piggul.
    - **R' Mari** said, we can prove this from a Mishna which says, whoever does the kemitza, puts it into a keili, brings it to the Mizbe'ach, and offers it on the Mizbe'ach. Now, we understand why the kemitza is needed, because that is the "shechita", and the bringing it to the Mizbe'ach is the holacha, and the offering is the "zrika". What is the significance of putting it into a keili? You can't say it is like the kabbalah, because kabbalah after shechita of an animal comes on its own into a keili whereas by a mincha the Kohen must put it into a keili!? Rather, it must be that since it is essential that the mincha be put into a kli shareis it is considered important and can therefore be the basis to make it piggul. Similarly, with regard to dipping his finger into the blood, since it is needed, it is considered to be the holacha for that korbon and therefore can serve as the basis for piggul.
      - The Gemara says this is no proof. It may be that putting the mincha into the kli shareis is the kabbalah, because why should there be a difference if it goes on its own or if the Kohen puts it in!?
      - **Q:** Maybe we can say that this is a machlokes among Tanna'im. One Braisa says that the dipping of the finger with piggul intent cannot make the chatas piggul, and another Braisa says that it can. Maybe we can say that they argue whether or not the dipping is considered to be the avodah of holacha!? **A:** It may be that all agree that it is holacha, and the machlokes is that the first Braisa follows the **Rabanan** who say that piggul intent during the holacha can make the korbon piggul, and the second Braisa holds like **R' Shimon** who says it cannot.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** If the second Braisa follows **R' Shimon**, why does he discuss dipping the finger? **R' Shimon** says that only a korbon offered on the outside Mizbe'ach, like a shelamim, can become piggul!? **A:** Rather, both Braisos follow the **Rabanan**. The Braisa that says dipping the finger can make piggul refers to a chatas offered inside, and the Braisa that says it cannot make piggul refers to a chatas that is offered on the outside Mizbe'ach.
  - Although it seems obvious that dipping the finger could not be the basis for piggul for an outside chatas, we would think that since we learn out halachos for the outside chatas from the pasuk that discusses the Kohen dipping his finger into the blood, the dipping of the finger is a significant avodah even for the outside korbon.

### -----Daf 7'--14-----

#### R' SHIMON MACHSHIR B'HILUCH

- **Reish Lakish** said, **R' Shimon** would agree that the holacha of a chatas offered on the inside Mizbe'ach done with the intent of piggul would make the korbon piggul, because the korbon could not be offered without this holacha.
  - **Q:** **R' Shimon** has said that piggul only applies for a korbon that is brought on the outside Mizbe'ach!? **A:** **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said, although he says that such a korbon could not become piggul, he would agree that the korbon becomes passul with that intent, based on a kal v'chomer – if the psul of lishma, which doesn't apply to shelamim applies to chatas, then the psul of piggul, which does apply to shelamim, will certainly apply to a chatas.
    - **Q:** We now see that he says the psul of piggul (that the korbon will be eaten or offered beyond its allowable time) applies to a chatas offered on the inside Mizbe'ach. How does he know that the psul of an intent that the korbon will be eaten or offered outside of its allowable place also applies to such a chatas? It can't be learned from piggul, because piggul is different in that it carries kares!? It also can't be learned from the case of not lishma, because that applied even to a korbon offered on a "bamah" whereas "outside of its allowable place" did not!? **A:** The intent of not lishma is only a psul for chatas and Pesach, and chatas and Pesach were never allowed to be brought on a bamah. **A2:** When the pasuk says "shlishi" it refers to an intention for beyond its time, and when it says "piggul" it refers to an intention of outside its allowable place. The mention of both in the same pasuk creates a hekesh between the two.
  - **Rava** said, if **R' Shimon** agrees with his son **R' Elazar**, that the space between the Mizbe'ach and the Ulam is considered to be "the north of the Azarah", then intent during the holacha for an inside chatas would not be effective unless the Kohen had the intent from the point of the doorway of the Ulam and further inside beyond that.
    - Also, if he holds like **R' Yehuda**, who says that the floor of the Azarah between the Mizbe'ach and the Ulam can make things kadosh like the Mizbe'ach itself, then when the Kohen carries out the "bazichin" from the Shulchan (which is the equivalent to the Lechem Hapanim of taking blood of an animal to the Mizbe'ach), the only time a piggul intent would create a problem would be when that intent was had before he leaves the Ulam. Once he leaves, it would no longer create piggul.
    - Further, if he holds that the Ulam and the Heichal have the same kedusha, then the only place where piggul intent would create a problem would be while he is walking in the doorway of the Ulam.
    - Further, if he holds that the doorway has the same kedusha as the Ulam itself, the only time that piggul intent would be effective would be when he stretches out his hand from the doorway of the Ulam into the Azarah.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- Further, if he holds that carrying not by foot (e.g. by stretching out the hand) is not considered to be a holacha, then there would be no time at all that a piggul intent would create a problem.
- **Abaye** said to the one who would loudly repeat the shiur of **R' Chisda**, ask **R' Chisda** what the halacha is if holacha is done by a non-Kohen. **R' Chisda** told him it would be valid, as can be seen from a pasuk which says that the Kohanim took the blood of the Pesach from the hands of the one who shechted it and threw it onto the Mizbe'ach. Since the shechita can be done by a non-Kohen, that means the holacha here could have been done by a non-Kohen as well.
  - **Q: R' Sheishes** asked, a Braisa clearly says it would be passul!? **TEYUFTA!**
    - **Q: R' Chisda** had a pasuk that supported him!? **A:** The pasuk is referring to where the non-Kohen held the blood, without moving it at all ("he acted like a pillar").
  - **Rabbah and R' Yosef** both said, that whether a holacha done by a non-Kohen is valid is actually a machlokes between **R' Shimon and the Rabanan** – according to **R' Shimon** who says that an avodah that a korbon can be done without is not an avodah, he would say this holacha is valid. According to the **Rabanan** it would be passul.
    - **Q: Abaye** asked, shechita is an avodah that a korbon can't be done without, and yet it is valid when done by a non-Kohen!? **A:** They answered that shechita is not an avodah.
      - **Q:** We find that **R' Zeira** learns from a pasuk that the shechita of a para adumah by a non-Kohen is passul, which means that it is an avodah!? **A:** A para adumah only has monetary kedusha and therefore the shechita is not an avodah at all. The reason it needs a Kohen is based on the pasuk.
        - **Q:** We should say that if the Kohen is needed for something which only has monetary kedusha and therefore shows that its shechita is an avodah, it should surely be needed for something that has full kedusha and its shechita should certainly be considered an avodah!? **A: R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said, we find that tzaraas must be seen by a Kohen, and that has nothing to do with it being an avodah. The same is true for shechita.
    - **Q:** The taking of the limbs to the Mizbe'ach is an avodah that a korbon can be brought without, and yet a pasuk teaches that it must be done by a Kohen!? **A:** Where the pasuk requires it, a Kohen is needed. Otherwise, for such an avodah a Kohen is not needed.
      - **Q:** If taking the limbs to the Mizbe'ach, which is not needed to bring a kapparah, needs a Kohen, then surely taking the blood to the Mizbe'ach, which is needed to bring a kapparah, should need to be done by a Kohen!? **A:** In fact, we have learned that **Ulla in the name of R' Elazar** said that holacha done by a non-Kohen would be passul even according to **R' Shimon**.
- **Q:** Is holacha without moving the feet (the Kohen stands still and passes it along closer to the Mizbe'ach) considered to be "holacha" or not? **A:** A Braisa says that holacha done while sitting is passul. That would suggest that if he is standing similar to sitting (i.e. he passes it along while standing still) it would be valid.
  - This is no proof. The case of sitting may be that he drags himself along while sitting, and the similar case of standing would be that he drags his feet along instead of walking. However, it may be that standing still is not considered to be a holacha.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from a Mishna that says that on Erev Pesach the blood of the Pesach was passed along from one Kohen to the next until it reached the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** It may be that the Kohen shuffled his feet a little, and didn't remain perfectly in place.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from another Mishna that says, if a valid Kohen gave the blood to a passul Kohen, it must be returned to the valid Kohen. This shows that passing it to the passul Kohen is not called holacha!? **A:** It may be that it is a holacha and his handing it to the passul Kohen and then taking it from him is therefore considered a valid holacha for that distance of space.
  - We have learned that **Ulla in the name of R' Yochanan** said that a holacha without moving the feet is not considered to be a holacha.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** If this was done, can it now be rectified by taking the blood back to the starting point and doing a proper holacha? **A:** From the fact that the Mishna quoted above says that the valid Kohen should take it back from the passul Kohen, it must be that it is able to rectified (for the distance covered by giving it to the passul Kohen).
  - This is no proof. It may be that the passul Kohen was further away from the Mizbe'ach than the valid Kohen when it was handed to the passul Kohen, and therefore no distance was travelled by handing it to the passul Kohen.

### -----Daf 10---15-----

- **Ulla in the name of R' Yochanan** said, a holacha done not by foot is not a valid holacha. We see that **R' Yochanan** held that if done in this way it cannot be rectified.
  - **Q: R' Nachman** asked **Ulla**, a Mishna says, if the blood spilled from the kli shareis onto the floor and the Kohen then picked it up it is valid. Now, surely some of the blood moved towards the Mizbe'ach when it fell out of the keili, and we see that even though this blood moved there without a holacha done by foot it is still valid!? **A:** The Mishna is talking about where the blood spilled in the direction *away* from the Mizbe'ach.
    - **Q:** When a liquid spills it goes in all directions!? **A:** The case is where it spilled on an incline that inclined away from the Mizbe'ach. Or we can say that it spilled into a hole and therefore did not spread from there. Or we can say that the Mishna is talking about a case where the blood was very thick and therefore did not spread once it fell on the ground.
      - **Q:** Would the Tanna teach a case that has such narrow application? Also, when the later Mishna wants to give the corresponding case of where it would be passul it gives the case of where it spills onto the floor before ever being placed into a kli shareis. Now, why didn't it just say that in both cases it spilled after being in a kli shareis, but when it falls towards the Mizbe'ach it is passul and when it falls away it is valid!? This is a **TEYUFTA** of **Ulla**.
- We have learned, the question of whether a holacha not by foot is valid is actually the machlokes between **R' Shimon and the Rabanan** in our Mishna. All would agree that improper intent during a long holacha (a holacha by foot) would make the korbon into piggul. The machloes is when there was only a short holacha (he put the blood on the Mizbe'ach by just stretching out his hand). **R' Shimon** would hold this is not a holacha and that is why an improper intent had during that would not make it piggul, and the **Rabanan** would hold that it is a holacha, and that is why it would become piggul.
  - **Q:** In EY they laughed at this understanding of **R' Shimon's** view. If **R' Shimon** holds that a short holacha is not a holacha, then in the case of a bird chatas how would it ever become piggul (and we know that it can)!? If he had an improper intent before the blood came out of the bird, it would not make it piggul (because that is considered to be a short holacha). If he had the improper thought after the blood came out of the bird (but before the blood reached the Mizbe'ach), at that point the mitzvah is already done and it can no longer become piggul!? **A:** We can say that it can become piggul for an intent had between the time the blood leaves the bird and before it hits the Mizbe'ach. In fact, we find that the avodah is not considered completed until the blood reaches the Mizbe'ach. **R' Zeira** said that if a Kohen did zrika and his hand was cut off before the blood reached the Mizbe'ach (making him a baal mum), the zrika would be passul based on a pasuk. Based on this, this could not have been the reason that they laughed in EY.
    - **R' Pappa and R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** came from **Rav** and said, the reason they laughed is because in our Mishna they are clearly arguing about a case of a long holacha! Rather, it is regarding a short holacha that all agree that an improper intent would not make the korbon into piggul. It is regarding an intent had during the long holacha that there is a machlokes.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If the holacha was done by a non-Kohen, and a Kohen then took the blood back to the starting point and did the holacha again, there is a machlokes between the sons of **R' Chiya** and **R' Yannai** – one says it is valid, because the holacha can be rectified and the other says it is passul, because it cannot be rectified.
  - If a Kohen did the holacha and a non-Kohen then took the blood back to the starting point and did the holacha again, **R' Simi bar Ashi** said, the one who in the previous case said it was valid would hold in this case that it is passul, and visa-versa. **Rava** said, that even the one who said it was passul in the previous case would hold that it is passul in this case as well, because once the blood is taken back to the starting point it is necessary to take it back to the Mizbe'ach, and therefore a full holacha is needed for the second trip as well.
    - **R' Yirmiya** said to **R' Ashi** that **R' Yirmiya MiDifti** said, whether the second trip to the Mizbe'ach is considered to be the avodah of holacha is actually a machlokes between **R' Eliezer and the Rabanan** in our Mishna, based on the explanation of **Rava**, who says that they agree that if after the kabbalah the Kohen walked further away from the Mizbe'ach that would be an unnecessary walking and an improper intent would therefore not make it piggul. The machlokes is where it was brought to the Mizbe'ach and then taken away. In that case the **Rabanan** say that the second trip to the Mizbe'ach is considered to be a full holacha and **R' Eliezer** holds that it is not.
      - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that the case of an unnecessary holacha according to **R' Eliezer** is where after the kabbalah the Kohen takes it farther away from the Mizbe'ach. This suggests that if after taking it to the Mizbe'ach he then takes it away, the return trip *would* be a necessary holacha!? **A: Rava** said, if that is what the Braisa says, I retract my explanation.

### HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL HAZEVACHIM

### PEREK KOL HAZEVACHIM SHEKIBLU DAMAN -- PEREK SHEINI

#### MISHNA

- If the kabbalah of the blood of a korbon was done by a non-Kohen, an onein, a tvul yom, a mechusar kippurim, by a Kohen who wasn't wearing all the bigdei Kehunah, or one who didn't wash his hands and feet, or did not have a bris milah, or who was tamei, or who was sitting, or was standing on keilim, or on an animal, or on someone else's feet, the kabbalah is passul. If he did the kabbalah with his left hand it is passul, but **R' Shimon** says it would be valid.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that the avodah of a zar (non-Kohen) is passul? **A: Levi** taught, the pasuk says "daber ehl Aharon v'ehl banav v'yinzru mikadshei Bnei Yisrael v'lo yichalilu". The pasuk speaks of a tamei Kohen and teaches that he may not do the avodah of a korbon of the Bnei Yisrael. Now, what do the words "Bnei Yisrael" come to exclude? It can't exclude the korbanos of women, because those can't be brought by a tamei Kohen! It also can't come to exclude the korbon of a goy, because even the tzitz (which normally helps to make valid a korbon that was offered when tamei) doesn't help for a goy, so certainly we can't say that his korbon can be brought by a tamei Kohen!? **A:** Rather, the pasuk should be understood as follows – "v'yinzru mikadshei" – teaches that a tamei Kohen may not bring any korbon, and "Bnei Yisrael v'lo yichalilu" teaches that a zar may not do any of the Avodos.

### -----Daf 17--16-----

- The Gemara just gave one source for the avodah done by a zar being passul. The Gemara now says, **R' Yishmael** said, we learn this from a kal v'chomer – if a Kohen who is a baal mum, who may eat kodshei kodashim, and yet his avodah is passul, then a zar, who may not eat kodshei kodashim, surely his avodah will be passul.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A baal mum is different, because the Torah treated the Kohen who is a baal mum like the korban that is a baal mum, and that is why his avodah is passul!? **A:** A Kohen who is tamei is also passul for Avodah although that doesn't apply to an animal.
- **Q:** Maybe a tamei is passul because he has the ability to make other things tamei? **A:** A baal mum doesn't have that ability and yet he is passul. We will go back and forth with the result being a tzad hashava in that they are both warned not to do the avodah and if they do it the avodah is passul. The same can be said regarding a zar – he is warned not to do the avodah, and therefore if he does it, the avodah is passul. The pasuk that provides the warning for the zar is “v'zar lo yikrav Aleichem”.
  - **Q:** We can ask that a baal mum and a tamei are different in that they do not become mutar to do the avodah on a bamah, but a zar is, and therefore it cannot be grouped along with them!? **A:** Rather, instead of saying that a tamei proves the point, we will say that it is an onein that proves that his psul of avodah is not because the korban shares that psul. We will then ask that an onein is different because he may not eat maaser sheini? We will say that a baal mum shows that that is not the determinative factor. We will go back and forth with the result being a tzad hashava in that they are both warned not to do the avodah and if they do it the avodah is passul. The same can be said regarding a zar – he is warned not to do the avodah, and therefore if he does it, the avodah is passul.
    - **Q:** Here too we can ask that an onein and a tamei are different in that they do not become mutar to do the avodah on a bamah, but a zar is, and therefore it cannot be grouped along with them!? **A: R' Sama the son of Rava** asked, who said that an onein is assur to do avodah on a bamah? Maybe it is mutar!?
- **R' Mesharshiya** said, we learn the psul of a zar from a kal v'chomer from a the psul of the avodah done by a Kohen while sitting. If a Kohen who sits may eat a korban and yet his avodah is passul, then surely a zar who may not eat a korban is surely passul to do avodah.
  - **Q:** We can ask that the psul of one who sits also applies to witnesses who give testimony, and maybe that is why it also makes the avodah passul!? **A:** We can darshen the kal v'chomer from a talmid chochom who is a witness, who does not need to stand when he testifies.
    - **Q:** We can ask that the category of sitting is different since most people would be passul to give testimony when sitting!? **A: R' Mesharshiya** does not refute a kal v'chomer based on such a question. We can also answer that even if he does use such a question, we can still learn the psul of the zar from the case of one who sits *and* one of the other psulim we have been discussing (the baal mum, the onein, or the tamei).
  - **Q:** Where do we see that one who does the avodah while sitting would be valid for a bamah? **A:** The pasuk says “laamod lifnei Hashem l'sharso” – one must stand only when he is before Hashem, not when he is by a bamah.

### ONEIN

- **Q:** How do we know that an onein makes the avodah passul? **A:** The pasuk says “umin haMikdash lo yeitzei v'lo yichalel” which teaches that the Kohen Gadol as an onein does not make the avodah passul. This suggests that another Kohen as an onein would make it passul. **R' Elazar** said, we learn it from the pasuk where Aharon said “hein hikrivu?” Aharon was saying that the reason the chatas was burned was not because it had been offered by his sons who were oneinim, because it was in fact offered by Aharon himself. We see that had it been offered by his sons who were oneinim it would have been passul for that reason.
  - **R' Elazar** did not use the first pasuk, because he says that the inference is not justified. The one who learns it from the earlier pasuk did not learn it from **R' Elazar's** pasuk, because he understands it as Aharon saying, the reason the chatas was burned was because it became tamei.
  - The yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** taught a Braisa that learned the psul of onein from a kal v'chomer from a baal mum. A baal mum may eat a korban and yet his avodah is passul, so certainly an onein, who may not eat a korban, his avodah is passul.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A baal mum is different, because the Torah treated the Kohen who is a baal mum like the korbon that is a baal mum, and that is why his avodah is passul!? **A:** A zar is also passul for Avodah although that doesn't apply to an animal.
  - **Q:** Maybe a zar is passul because he has no remedy to fix his psul, but an onein whose status will change is not passul? **A:** A baal mum often can be remedied, and yet he is passul. We will go back and forth with the result being a tzad hashava in that they are both warned not to do the avodah and if they do it the avodah is passul. The same can be said regarding an onein – he is warned not to do the avodah, and therefore if he does it, the avodah is passul. We see this warning from the pasuk of “hein hikrivu”, and they hold that the reason it was burned was because of the aninus.
  - **Q:** We can ask that the others are passul because there is no exception to their rule. However, with an onein there is an exception (the Kohen Gadol who is an onein is not psasul for the Avodah) and that is maybe why it does not passul the avodah!? **A:** The case of tamei has an exception (when done for a tzibbur) and still it makes the avodah passul.
    - **Q:** We can ask that the case of tamei makes it passul because a tamei has the ability to make other things tamei!? **A:** The case of the baal mum and the zar show that that is not the determinative factor. We will go back and forth with the result being a tzad hashava in that they are both warned not to do the avodah and if they do it the avodah is passul. The same can be said regarding an onein – he is warned not to do the avodah, and therefore if he does it, the avodah is passul.
    - **Q:** We can ask that all except onein don't have an exception for the korbon of an individual (tumah is only mutar for the tzibbur), and they are therefore different than onein!? **A:** Since there is an exception to the category of tumah, we can't say that it is considered not to have an exception just because the case is different for the korbon of an individual.
- **R' Mesharshiya** said, we learn the psul of an onein from a kal v'chomer from the psul of the avodah done by a Kohen while sitting. If a Kohen who sits may eat a korbon and yet his avodah is passul, then surely an onein who may not eat a korbon is surely passul to do avodah.
  - **Q:** We can ask that the psul of one who sits also applies to witnesses who give testimony, and maybe that is why it is also makes the avodah passul!? **A:** We can darshen the kal v'chomer from a talmid chochom who is a witness, who does not need to stand when he testifies.
  - **Q:** We can ask that the category of sitting is different since most people would be passul to give testimony when sitting!? **A:** **R' Mesharshiya** does not refute a kal v'chomer based on such a question. We can also answer that even if he does use such a question, we can still learn the psul of the onein from the case of one who sits *and* one of the other psulim we have been discussing (the baal mum, the zar, or the tamei).

### ONEIN PASSUL

- **Rabbah** said, an onein is only passul for an individual's korbon but would be valid for the korbon of the tzibbur. This can be learned from a kal v'chomer from tumah – if tumah, which has no exception for the Kohen Gadol for an individual's korbon is mutar even for a regular Kohen for a korbon tzibbur, then an onein which is mutar for the Kohen Gadol even for an individual's korbon should surely be mutar even for a regular Kohen for a korbon tzibbur!
  - **Q: Rava bar Ahilai** asked, maybe we should instead learn a kal v'chomer from tumah and learn that if it is mutar for a regular Kohen for a korbon tzibbur and still is not mutar for a Kohen Gadol for an individual's korbon, then aninus, which is not mutar for a regular Kohen for a korbon tzibbur should not be mutar for the Kohen Gadol for an individual's korbon!? Also, we should learn that a Kohen Gadol who is tamei may do the avodah even for an individual's korbon, from a kal v'chomer from onein – if onein is not mutar for a regular Kohen for a korbon tzibbur and yet it is mutar for the Kohen Gadol for an



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

individual's korban, then tumah which is mutar for a regular Kohen for a korban tzibbur should certainly be mutar for a Kohen Gadol for an individual's korban!? Also, we should make a kal v'chomer from onein (that is only mutar for a Kohen Gadol and not a regular Kohen) to teach that tumah should only be mutar for the Kohen Gadol, and not a regular Kohen!? **A:** Rather, since we have contradicting kal v'chomers, we will not darshen any of them, and we will instead stick to the halacha given in each pasuk.

### -----Daf 17-----

#### TVUL YOM

- **Q:** How do we know that the avodah of a tvul yom (one who was tamei, went to the mikvah, and is now waiting for sunset to become tahor) is passul? **A:** A Braisa says, **R' Simai** says the pasuk of "kedoshim yihiyu LeiLokeihem v'lo yichalilu" is not needed to teach that the avodah of a Kohen who is tamei is passul, because that is learned from the pasuk of "v'yinazru". Therefore, it must be coming to teach regarding a tvul yom, that his avodah is passul.
  - **Q:** The pasuk before this pasuk speaks of a Kohen who makes a bald spot in mourning or shaves with a razor. Maybe this pasuk of "v'lo yichalilu" comes to say that the avodah of such a Kohen is passul? **A:** There is a gezeira shava from this pasuk to terumah, which teaches that this Kohen who does the avodah is chayuv misah at the Hands of Heaven. The teaches that the pasuk is referring to a Kohen who may not eat terumah. This must therefore be referring to a tvul yom, and not a Kohen who made a bald spot or shaved with a razor.
  - **Q: Rabbah** asked, why do we need separate pesukim to teach that the avodah of a tamei, of a tvul yom, and of a mechusar kippurim are each tamei (they are all similar and we would therefore think we can learn one from the other)? **A:** They are all necessary. If the Torah would only teach us regarding a tamei we would say that his avodah is passul, because he has the ability to make something else tamei, but the others don't and therefore their avodah is not passul. If we only had a pasuk for tvul yom we could not learn mechusar kippurim from it, because a tvul yom may not eat terumah but a mechusar kippurim may. If we only had a pasuk for mechusar kippurim we could not learn tvul yom from it, because a mechusar kippurim needs to do something to change his status (he must bring his korban), whereas a tvul yom does not need to do anything (he just needs to wait for the sun to set).
    - **Q:** Maybe the Torah could have written only two of them and the third could have been learned from the other two? **A:** Which could it not have written about? It could not have left out mechusar kippurim, because a mechusar kippurim may eat terumah and the others may not. It could not have left out tvul yom, because it does not need to take any action to become tahor. If you will say that even so, the tumah of a mechusar kippurim is on a lesser level than that of a tvul yom (because the mechusar kippurim already had sunset), we can say that **Rabbah** holds that the mechusar kippurim of a zav has the status of a full-fledged zav, and therefore it is not viewed as having a lesser tumah status than a tvul yom. Therefore, tvul yom could not be learned from the other two.
      - The concept of whether a mechusar kippurim of a zav has the status of a full-fledged zav is actually a matter of machlokes among Tanna'im in a Braisa. The Braisa says, if the parah adumah was burned by an onein or a mechusar kippurim, it is valid. **Yosef Habavli** says, if it is burned by an onein it is valid, but if it is burned by a mechusar kippurim it is passul. Presumably, the machlokes is that **Yosef Habavli** holds that a mechusar kippurim of a zav has the status of a full-fledged zav, and that is why the parah adumah would be passul when he burned it, and the **T"K** holds that a mechusar kippurim of a zav does not get the status of a full-fledged zav.
        - It may be that this is not the machlokes. It may be that all agree that a mechusar kippurim of a zav has the status of a full-fledged zav. The machlokes regarding parah adumah is, the pasuk says "v'hiza hatahor", which seems to be an extra pasuk, and teaches that there is someone who is thought of as being tamei to

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

some degree and yet may still do the parah adumah process. This teaches that a tvul yom may do the parah adumah process. The machlokes would be that the **T”K** holds this refers to the tvul yom of any tumah – including the tumah of a zav. **Yosef Habavli** holds that it only refers to the tumah discussed in that parsha – tumas meis. Therefore, an onein and a tamei sheretz, which are more lenient than tumas meis, can be learned from a kal v’chomer from tumas meis that they may also do the parah adumah process. However, mechusar kippurim of a zav, which is more stringent in that the tumah came from his body, cannot be learned from a tvul yom.

### MECHUSAR BEGADIM

- **Q:** How do we know that the avodah of a Kohen who was not wearing the bigdei kehuna is passul? **A: R’ Avahu in the name of R’ Yochanan** (or in the name of **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Shimon**) learns from a pasuk that a Kohen is not fit to do the Avodah when he is not wearing the bigdei kehuna, because he does not have the status of “kehunah”. Therefore, he would be no different than a non-Kohen.

### -----Daf פ”---18-----

- The Gemara had said that the psul of the avoda of a Kohen who was not wearing the bigdei kehuna is learned from a pasuk that says that such a Kohen does not have the status of kehunah, and would therefore be treated as a non-Kohen.
  - **Q:** Another Braisa gives a different source for the psul of the avodah of a Kohen who is not wearing the bigdei kehunah!? The Braisa says there is a gezeira shava of “chukah” which connects the avodah of a Kohen who is not wearing the bigdei kehuna and a Kohen who does the avodah without washing his hands and feet, to a Kohen who does the avodah after drinking wine. This teaches that just as the avodah of the Kohen who drank wine is passul, the same is for the avodah of a Kohen who is not wearing the bigdei kehuna and a Kohen who does the avodah without washing his hands and feet. If so, why do we need the pasuk of **R’ Avahu in the name of R’ Yochanan**? **A:** The pasuk of the Kohen who drank wine says that he is chayuv misah at the Hands of Heaven if he then does the avodah. Now, this does not apply to all avodos, but only to some of the avodos. If we only had the gezeira shava, we would say that the psul of the Kohen who is not wearing the bigdei kehuna is only for these specific avodos. The pasuk is therefore needed to teach that *any* avodah that he does is passul.
    - **Q:** How do we know that any avodah done by a Kohen who drank wine is also passul? **A:** We learn this from the case of the Kohen who is not wearing the bigdei kehuna, with the gezeira shava of “chukah”.
      - **Q:** The Braisa said the psul of the Kohen who drank wine is learned from the pasuk of “ulehavdil bein hakodesh u’bein hachol”, so how can we say that it is learned from the gezeira shava!? **A:** That was taught before we learned that there is a gezeira shava.
      - **Q:** The Braisa introduces the gezeira shava as a method of learning the case of the Kohen who wasn’t wearing the begdei kehuna from the case of the Kohen who drank wine, not visa-versa!? **A:** The Braisa means to say that we need the gezeira shava to learn that the psul of the Kohen who drank wine and the Kohen who did not wash his hands and feet applies to *all* avodos, just like the psul of the Kohen who was not wearing the bigdei kehuna.
      - **Q:** Based on this, why do we need the pasuk of “ulihavdil...”? **A:** It is needed to teach the halacha of **Rav**, that one may not pasken after drinking wine.
  - **Q:** Another Braisa gives a different source for the psul of the avodah of a Kohen who is not wearing the bigdei kehunah!? The Braisa says, the pasuk of “v’nasnu bnei Aharon haKohen” teaches that the avodah must be done while in a state of “kehunah” (i.e. while wearing the bigdei kehuna), which teaches that if a Kohen Gadol does the avodah while wearing the bigdei kehunah of a regular Kohen, the avoda is passul. Now, if we have the earlier source, why is this needed? **A:** If we only had this pasuk we would

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

think that only avodos that are needed to make the kapparah become passul in this way, but other avodos would not become passul in this way. Therefore, the pasuk of “v’nasnu bnei Aharon haKohen”, which is written regarding an avodah that does not prevent the kapparah from taking place, teaches that even such an avodah becomes passul.

- **Q:** Another Braisa gives a different source for the psul of the avodah of a Kohen who is not wearing the bigdei kehunah!? The Braisa says, the pasuk of “v’archu bnei Aharon haKohanim eis hanesachim...” teaches that the avodah must be done while in a state of “kehunah” (i.e. while wearing the bigdei kehuna), which teaches that if a regular Kohen does the avodah while wearing the bigdei kehubah of a Kohen Gadol, the avodah is passul. Now, if we have the earlier source, why is this needed? **A:** If we only had the earlier pasuk we would think that the avodah is only passul if he is wearing less bigdei kehunah than he is supposed to. This pasuk therefore teaches that it is passul even if he is wearing more than he is supposed to.
- A Braisa says, if the bigdei kehunah were dragging on the ground (they were too long) or were hanging off the ground (they were too short) or were worn out and the Kohen wearing them did the avodah, the avodah is valid. If a Kohen wore two pairs of pants or two belts or if he was missing one of the required bigdei kehunah or was wearing one extra of the bigdei kehunah, or if he had a bandage on his skin that was between his skin and the bigdei kehuna, or if they were dirty with mud, or if they were torn, and he did the avodah, the avodah is passul.
  - **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, if the bigdei kehunah were dragging on the ground they are valid, but if they are hanging off the ground they are passul.
    - **Q:** The Braisa said that if they are hanging off the ground they are valid!? **A: Rami bar Chama** said, the Braisa is talking about where they fit properly and the Kohen then lifted them up with his belt. **Shmuel** was talking about where they did not fit properly.
    - **Rav** said, whether the bigdei kehunah were too long or too short, the avodah done while wearing them is passul.
      - **Q:** The Braisa refutes **Rav**!? You can’t answer that **Rav** holds that the Braisa says it is valid when the begadim are too long, because it is referring to where they are lifted with the belt and **Rav** holds that it is valid, because we view the part that is lifted by the belt as being cut off (so the begadim are therefore the proper size), because how will we understand the Braisa when it says that when the begadim are too short it is also valid? It can’t mean that they were really the proper size but were lifted by the belt, because **Rav** would have to view that as being cut off and being too short!? **A: R’ Zeira** said, **Rav** holds that these two cases in the Braisa are actually one case – if the begadim were too long and were shortened with the belt, it is valid.
  - **R’ Yirmiya** said, whether begadim that were too long are valid is actually a matter of machlokes among Tanna’im. One Braisa says that a 5 cornered garment is chayuv to have tzitzis and another Braisa says that it is not chayuv. Presumably, the machlokes is that the first Braisa holds that something extra is viewed as if it does not exist, and the second Braisa holds that it is viewed as if it does exist. Therefore, in our case, the first Braisa would hold that the part of the begadim that is longer than is needed is viewed as if it does not exist and the beged is therefore valid, and the second Braisa would hold that it is viewed as an extra garment and is therefore passul!
    - The Gemara says this is no proof. It may be that all hold that the extra is viewed as if it does exist. However, regarding tzitzis the pasuk says “asher tichaseh bah”, which teaches to include a five cornered garment in the mitzvah of tzitzis.
      - **Q:** What will the Tanna of the second Braisa learn from the pasuk of “asher tichaseh bah”? **A:** He uses it for the teaching of another Braisa, which learns from this pasuk that the garment of a blind person is chayuv in tzitzis (even though he can’t see the tzitzis). The first Braisa will learn this from the word “asher”. The second Braisa doesn’t darshen the word “asher” on its own.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the bigdei kehunah says “bahd”, which teaches that they must be made of linen, that they must be new, that they must be made of twisted threads, that each thread be made of six threads, and also that the Kohen may not wear other begadim (other than the bigdei kehunah) along with them.
  - **Q: Abaye** asked **R’ Yosef**, it makes sense to teach that they must be made of linen, to exclude any other material. However, what does it mean that they must be new? Does that mean to exclude that if they are worn out they are passul? The Braisa earlier said that worn out begadim are valid!? **A: R’ Yosef** said, you can’t understand the Braisa to mean that each of these concepts are absolutely essential, because the word “bahd” cannot teach that making each thread of 6 threads is essential, because the word “bahd” suggests a single thread. Rather, the Braisa lists requirements, some of which are l’chatchila and some of which are essential.
  - **Q:** How do we know that “bahd” means linen? **A: R’ Yosef the son of R’ Chanina** said, “bahd” refers to something that grows only one on its own. This refers to linen, which grows only one stalk per seed.
    - **Q:** Maybe it refers to wool, since each fiber grows separately on the animal? **A:** When wool grows it splits, thus making more than a single strand. Although linen also splits, that only happens when it is beaten and processed.
    - **Ravina** said, there is a pasuk in Yechezkel that says the bigdei kehunah were made of linen (“pishtim”). This shows that “bahd” must mean linen.
      - **Q: R’ Ashi** asked **Ravina**, until Yechezkel came along, how did they know that it meant linen? **A: Ravina** said we find other halachos that we learn from Yechezkel. What this means is that there was a kabbalah for the halacha and Yechezkel then came and supported it with a pasuk. The same can be said for this halacha.
      - The pasuk says the begadim should not be tied “bayaza”. **Abaye** explains, this means that they should not be tied in a place where they sweat. This is also taught in a Braisa which says they shall be tied at the height of the elbows.

### -----Daf 19-----

- A Mishna says, if a Kohen has a wound on his finger on Shabbos, he may wrap it in reed-grass in the Beis Hamikdash, but not elsewhere (it has healing properties and healing on Shabbos is assur D’Rabanan). To wrap the wound tightly with the grass in order to push out blood, is assur in the Beis Hamikdash as well. **R’ Yehuda the son of R’ Chiya** explained, that it is mutar to wrap a finger in grass, but not in a small belt, because that would be considered as if the Kohen is wearing additional clothing, which is not permitted. **R’ Yochanan** said, extra clothing is only a problem when worn in a place that the clothing of a Kohen is worn, not when something is worn on the finger.
  - **Q:** Why is it not a problem of “chatzitza”? **A:** The wound is on his left hand and the avodah is done with the right hand. Or, the wound is on the right hand, but not on a part of the hand that is used in the avodah (e.g. the back of his hand).
  - **R’ Yochanan** argues with **Rava**, because **Rava in the name of R’ Chisda** said, in the place of the Kohen’s clothing, even one hair is a chatzitza. Elsewhere, if the additional item is 3x3 fingers wide, it is considered an additional garment and is a problem. Less is not an issue.
    - It could be that **Rava** would agree with **R’ Yehuda the son of R’ Chiya**, because he may say that a small belt is significant and is therefore problematic even though it is less than 3x3.
  - **Another version** says, that **R’ Yehuda the son of R’ Chiya** explained that it is mutar to wrap a finger in grass, but not in a small belt, because that would be considered as if the Kohen is wearing additional clothing, which is not permitted. **R’ Yochanan** said, extra clothing that is smaller than 3x3 is only a problem when worn in a place that the clothing of a Kohen is worn, but when it is worn elsewhere, then if it is 3x3 it is problematic, but less than that it is not. According to this version, **R’ Yochanan** is saying the same thing as **Rava in the name of R’ Chisda**.
    - It could be that **Rava** would agree with **R’ Yehuda the son of R’ Chiya**, because he may say that a small belt is significant and is therefore problematic even though it is less than 3x3.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan**, why does the Mishna teach regarding reed-grass instead of saying that even a small belt would be mutar? **A:** It is teaching an additional point, that reed-grass has curative properties.
- **Q: Rava** asked, what is the halacha if wind blew into the bigdei kehuna as it was worn by the Kohen? Do we say that the pasuk requires that the clothing be “ahl besaro” and with the effects of the wind it is not, or do we say this is the normal way to wear clothing and therefore it is still valid?
  - **Q:** What if a louse goes between the clothing and the Kohen? If it is dead it is surely a chatzitza and a problem. If it is alive, do we say that since it comes and goes it is not a chatzitza or do we say that since the Kohen doesn't want it there it is a chatzitza?
  - **Q:** What if there is earth between the clothing and the Kohen? Now, regular earth is surely a chatzitza, but what about the dust from earth?
  - **Q:** What about the space between the Kohen's armpit and the clothing? Is that a problem because it is not “ahl Besaro” or is it not a problem because that is the normal way of wearing clothing?
  - **Q:** What if the Kohen puts his arm into the body of his shirt? Is his own body a chatzitza or not?
  - **Q:** What if there is a thread between the clothing and the Kohen? Now, a stray thread is certainly a chatzitza. The question is regarding a thread that is hanging from the clothing itself – is that a chatzitza?
  - **Q: Mar bar R' Ashi** asked, what if the Kohen's hair was long and went between his clothing and his body? Do we say that his hair is like his own body and is therefore not a chatzitza or do we say that it is not like his body and therefore is a chatzitza?
  - **Q: R' Zeira** asked, are tefillin a problem to be worn in that they would be considered as an additional article of clothing? Now, according to the view that one cannot fulfil the mitzvah of tefillin at night, since they would be a chatzitza at night they would also be considered a chatzitza (i.e. an extra) by day with regard to the bigdei kehunah. The question is according to the view that one can fulfil the mitzvah of tefillin at night – would an object of mitzvah (the tefillin) be considered an extra article of clothing (and be assur) or not? **A:** This question eventually was asked to **R' Ami**, who said that it is considered to be an additional article of clothing and would therefore be assur for the Kohen to wear while he does the Avodah.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that the Kohanim during the Avodah, the Levi'im during their singing, and the Yisraelim during their “maamad” are patur from tefilla and tefillin. This suggests that they are patur, but that if they do wear tefillin it would not be assur!? **A:** The Braisa means that it would even be assur.
      - **Q:** If so, the Braisa shouldn't say they are patur, it should say that it is assur!? **A:** For the Levi'im and Yisraelim it would never be assur, so it can't use the verbiage of “assur”.
    - **Q:** A Braisa clearly says that if a Kohen wears tefillin it is not problematic!? **A: R' Ami** was referring to the tefillin worn on the arm, and this Braisa is referring to the tefillin worn on the head. Although just as there can't be a chatzitza by the arm there likewise may not be a chatzitza by the head, the head tefillin is different, as we find that the Kohen Gadol would wear tefillin between his hat and the tzitz.

### MECHUSAR KIPPURIM

- **Q:** How do we know that this makes the avodah passul? **A: R' Huna** said, the pasuk says “v'chiper aleha haKohen vitaheira”, which teaches that before a person brings the korban there is still some level of tumah that he has.

### V'SHELO RICHUTZ YADAYIM V'RAGLAYIM

- This is learned from a gezeira shava of “chukah” from the case of the Kohen who does the avodah without wearing the bigdei kehunah.
- A Braisa says, if a Kohen Gadol did not go to the mikvah or wash his hands and feet from the kiyor between his changes of clothing and between the avodos, and he did the avodah, it is valid. However, if a Kohen Gadol or a regular Kohen did not wash his hands and feet in the morning (before beginning any avodah), the avodah is passul.
  - **R' Assi** asked **R' Yochanan**, the 5 required tevilos and 10 washings of the hands and feet of the Kohen Gadol on Yom Kippur are D'Oraisa, regarding which the pasuk says “chukah”, so why are they not

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

essential? **R' Yochanan** said, the pasuk ends off saying “uliveisham”, which teaches that only the wearing of the begadim are essential, but the tevilos and washings are not. **R' Assi** was very pleased with the answer. **R' Yochanan** said, the answer is not really valid, because if so, the washing of the morning should also not be essential!? **Chizkiya** said, the pasuk says “v’huysa lahem chak olam lo ulizaro lidorosam”, which teaches that only something that applies to *all* Kohanim (not just the Kohen Gadol) is essential, which is why only the morning washing is essential, but the others are not. **R' Yonason** said, we learn it from the pasuk of “virachatzu mimenu Moshe v’Aharon ubanav”, which teaches that only something that is essential for his sons (regular Kohanim) is essential for him (the Kohen Gadol), and something that is not essential for his sons is not essential for him.

- **R' Yonason** doesn't learn like **Chizkiya**, because he says that that pasuk is teaching regarding future generations. **Chizkiya** doesn't learn from the pasuk of **R' Yonason**, because he says like **R' Yose the son R' Chanina** who uses this pasuk to teach that the kiyor has to be large enough for 4 Kohanim to use at once.
- A Braisa says, the mitzvah of washing the hands and feet is done by the Kohen putting his right hand on his right foot and his left hand on his left foot and washes them in this position. **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says, he puts his hands one on the other and puts them on both feet which are also one on the other and then washes them in this position. The **Rabanan** said, a person cannot stand like that!?
  - **R' Yosef** explained that according to **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** another Kohen would have to help the Kohen stand upright while doing this.
  - **Abaye** explained, the machlokes is whether standing while being supported is considered to be “standing”, and the washing must be done while standing, because it is referred to as “lishareis” (an avodah), which must be done when standing.
- A Braisa says, if a Kohen washed his hands and feet during the day, he does not need to do so again at night for avodah that he will do then. If he did the washing at night, he must do another washing when the morning comes. This is the view of **Rebbi**, who said that the passing of the night nullifies the washing that was done. **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** says that the passing of the night does not nullify the washing that was done.
  - A Braisa says, **Rebbi** says if a Kohen was offering korbanos on the Mizbe'ach all night, he still needs a new washing in the morning. **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** says, that if he continues to do avodah then the washing continues to be effective, even if it spans a period of 10 days.
    - Both Braisos are needed. If we only had the first Braisa we would say that **Rebbi** holds that way there because the avodah was not being done continuously, but if it was done in that way he would agree with **R' Elazar**. If we only had the second Braisa we would say that **R' Elazar** holds that way there only because the avodah was done continuously, but if it was not, we would say that he agrees with **Rebbi**.
    - **Rebbi's** view is based on the word “b'gishtam” in the pasuk, which suggests that a new avodah needs a new washing, and the morning is called a new avodah. **R' Elazar's** view is based on the word “b'vo'am”, which suggests that only a new coming to the Azarah requires a new washing.
      - **Rebbi** says that “b'vo'am” teaches that as long as it is in the same day a new washing is not required. **R' Elazar** says that “b'gishtam” teaches that a washing is only required when he enters to do an avodah, not for another reason.
        - **Q:** Why would we think that if no avodah was going to be done he would have to wash? The pasuk says “lishareis”, which means the washing is for when an avodah will be done!? **A:** Rather, “b'gishtam” is needed for the drasha of **R' Acha bar Yaakov**, who learned from this pasuk that the washing of the Kohen Gadol after he goes to the mikvah on Yom Kippur is done after he is dressed.
        - The words “l'haktir isheh” teach that washing the hands and feet must even be done for an avodah which does not bring a kapparah.