



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Zevachim Daf Tes Zayin

- 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.
 - **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 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 korbon 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 korbon and yet his avodah is passul, then surely a zar 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 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 korbon and yet his avodah is passul, so certainly an onein, who may not eat a korbon, his avodah is passul.
 - **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 pasul 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 individual's korbon, then tumah which is mutar for a regular Kohen for a korbon tzibbur should certainly be mutar for a Kohen Gadol for an individual's korbon!? 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.