



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

### Zevachim Daf Chuf Gimmel

- The Gemara is discussing the view of the Elders of the South, that a tamei Kohen's avodah is passul only when he is tamei from a sheretz, not when he is tamei meis.
  - **Ulla** said, **Reish Lakish** objected to this view. He said, which has a stronger power to be able to bring a korbán when tamei – the Kohen or the owner of the korbán? It is the owner of the korbán, because when he is tamei sheretz he can still have his Korbán Pesach offered for him, but a Kohen who is tamei sheretz and does the avodah makes the avodah passul. Now, if in a place when the owner is tamei sheretz he may still send his korbán to be offered and yet a Kohen who is tamei sheretz who does the avodah would make the avodah passul, then in a place where if the owner is tamei meis he may not bring the korbán, for sure a Kohen who is tamei meis who does the avodah should make it passul! Yet, you hold that the avodah of this Kohen would be valid!?
  - The Gemara says, the Elders of the South hold that an owner who is tamei meis *may* send his Korbán Pesach to be offered, and therefore we don't have this question.
    - **Q:** The pasuk seems to clearly say that a tamei meis may not send his Pesach to be offered (and must instead wait for Pesach Sheini)!? **A:** The pasuk is teaching l'chatchila. However, b'dieved if he sent it he will fulfill his obligation even though he can't eat it.
    - **Q:** The pasuk says "ish lefi achlo", which teaches that a Pesach may only be shechted on behalf of someone who can eat it!? **A:** That is l'chatchila.
      - **Q:** A Braisa learns from a pasuk, based on a hekesh, that even b'dieved it could not be shechted for someone who cannot eat it!? **A:** The Elders of the South do not make this hekesh.
      - **Q:** Still, we can ask on them based on a kal v'chomer - if in a place when the owner is tamei sheretz he may still send his korbán to be offered l'chatchila and yet a Kohen who is tamei sheretz who does the avodah would make the avodah passul, then in a place where if the owner is tamei meis he may not bring the korbán l'chatchila, for sure a Kohen who is tamei meis who does the avodah should make it passul!?
      - **Q:** A Mishna says, with regard to a nazir and the one doing a Pesach, the tzitz effects acceptance for tumah of the blood, but not for tumah of the body (the case is where the owner of the korbán became tamei). Now, this can't be referring to where he became tamei sheretz, because you have already said that for such tumah a person can bring the Pesach! Rather, it must be referring to tumas meis, and the Mishna says that the tzitz would not effect acceptance, which means that a tamei meis may not send his Pesach to be offered, and if he does it will be passul!? **A:** The case is where the Kohen became tamei sheretz. However, in a case where the owner was tamei meis, if he sent his Pesach he would have fulfilled his obligation b'dieved.
      - **Q:** The Mishna continues and says that if he became tamei with "tumah of the deep" (a tumah that was not known to anybody) the tzitz does effect acceptance. Now according to what you have said, this is referring to tumas sheretz. However, **R' Chiya**

taught a Braisa that says that “tumah of the deep” only applies to tumas meis, which presumably comes to exclude and say that it does not apply to tumas sheretz!? **A:** It comes to exclude “tumah of the deep” of zivah. But, it would apply to tumas sheretz, and it applies to both the owner and to the Kohen.

- **Q:** We find that **Rami bar Chama** asks whether “tumah of the deep” applies to the Kohen or only to the owner. Based on your explanation of the Mishna he should be able to answer from the Mishna that it applies to the Kohen as well!? **A:** They clearly argue on **Rami bar Chama**, who would hold that if a Pesach is offered on behalf of someone who is tamei meis, it would be passul.
- **Q:** A Braisa darshens pesukim to teach that the tzitz brings acceptance for tumah, since we find that there is an exception to the psul of tumah in the case of the tzibbur. Now, this can’t be referring to tumas sheretz, because there is no exception for this tumah for the tzibbur (if a person is tamei sheretz he may bring his Pesach on the 14<sup>th</sup> and doesn’t have to wait for Pesach Sheini, therefore if a tzibbur was tamei the psul of tumah would not be put aside). Rather, it refers to tumas meis, and presumably refers to where the owner became tamei meis. We see that if the tamei meis sends his korbon the tzitz would make it accepted. Now, this can’t refer to a korbon nazir, because if a nazir becomes tamei meis he loses his entire nezirus count. Rather, it must refer to Korbon Pesach and we see that a tamei meis can send his Pesach to be offered!? **A:** The Braisa may be referring to tumas sheretz, and the Braisa means that the concept of tumah has an exception, not that there is an exception of tumas sheretz itself.

#### YOSHEIV

- **Q:** How do we know this psul? **A: Rava in the name of R’ Nachman** said, the pasuk says that Hashem chose the Kohen “laamod ulishareis” – to stand and do the Avodah, not to sit.
  - A Braisa says, “laamod ulishareis” teaches this is a mitzvah and “ha’omdim” repeats the requirement to make it essential.
  - **Q: Rava asked R’ Nachman**, a Kohen who does the avodah when sitting is like a zar and his avodah is passul. If so, we should say that he is also chayuv misah at the Hands of Heaven like a zar!? So, why does a Braisa say that he is not chayuv misah? **A:** The reason is that the case of a Kohen who does the avodah without wearing the bigdei kehunah and the case of a Kohen who does the avodah without washing his hands and feet are two pesukim that both teach that he is chayuv misah, and therefore this rule cannot be applied to other cases. Even according to the view that we can learn from a place where there are two pesukim teaching the same thing, in this case we cannot, because there is a third pasuk, the pasuk of a Kohen who does the avodah after drinking wine, that teaches the same thing, and all agree that when there are three pesukim that teach the same thing this rule cannot be applied to other cases.