



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

### Zevachim Daf Yud Ches

- 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 bigdei 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 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.
  - 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.