



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

Zevachim Daf Kuf Beis

- The Gemara has been discussing whether Moshe had the status of a Kohen. The Gemara now says that this matter is actually the subject of a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says, the pasuk says "vayichar ahf Hashem b'Moshe". **R' Yehoshua ben Korcha** said, whenever the Torah states verbiage of "Charon ahf" there is always a manifestation of this anger that follows (e.g. in the form of a curse, or rebuke, etc.). However, in this pasuk there is no such manifestation. **R' Shimon ben Yochai** said, there is a manifestation here as well. He says we see this from the pasuk where Hashem said "halo Aharon achicha haLeivi". Now, Aharon was a Kohen so why is he being called a Leivi? The pasuk is teaching that Hashem told Moshe, you were supposed to be the Kohen and Aharon was supposed to remain a Leivi, but now I have given the Kehuna to Aharon. The **Chachomim** say that Moshe only had the status of a Kohen for the 7 days of the Milu'im. **Others** darshen pesukim to teach that Moshe remained a Kohen for his entire life, but the status did not pass to his children.
 - **Q:** Is it true that every "Charon ahf" has a manifestation of this anger? The pasuk says that Moshe left Paroh "bachari ahf", and we don't find a manifestation of that anger!? **A: Reish Lakish** said that Moshe slapped Paroh on the face before he left.
 - **Q:** There is a machlokes, where **Reish Lakish** learns from a pasuk that Hashem told Moshe that Paroh is a king and must therefore be respected, and **R' Yochanan** says that Hashem told Moshe that Paroh is a rasha and therefore need not be respected. How can we say that **Reish Lakish** said that Moshe slapped Paroh on the face!? **A:** We must reverse the views in this machlokes, so that it is **Reish Lakish** who holds that Hashem told Moshe that Paroh is a rasha and therefore need not be respected.
 - **R' Yannai** said, from the pasuk that says that Moshe told Paroh that Paroh's servants would come to look for Moshe and bow to him (after makas bechoros), although it was in fact Paroh who would do so, we learn that one must always fear and respect royalty. **R' Yochanan** said, we learn this concept from the pasuk that says that Eliyahu ran in front of the rasha Achav.
- **Ulla** darshens a pasuk to teach that Moshe wanted to be king but Hashem didn't give it to him.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, we have learned in a previous Braisa that he was the king!? **A: Rava** said, Moshe was the king, but he also wanted it to remain with his descendants. That is what was not given to him.

BAALEI MUMIN BEIN BAALEI MUMIN...

- This is learned from a Braisa. The Braisa says, the pasuk of "kol zachar" written regarding a mincha comes to include a Kohen with a mum. Now, this can't come to include him in the eating of the korbon, because that is learned from another pasuk. Rather, it comes to teach that a Kohen with a mum gets a share of the korbanos as well.
 - Another Braisa says that the pasuk of "kol zachar" written regarding a chatas comes to include a Kohen with a mum. Now, this can't come to include him in the eating of the korbon, because that is learned from another pasuk. It can't come to include that he gets a share of the korbanos, because that was learned from the pasuk regarding mincha. Rather, we would think that only a Kohen who used to not have a mum and then got a mum gets a share of korbanos. This pasuk teaches that even a Kohen who always had a mum gets a share as well.
 - Another Braisa says that the pasuk of "kol zachar" written regarding an asham comes to include a Kohen with a mum. Now, this can't come to include him in the eating of the korbon, because that is learned from another pasuk. It can't come to include that he gets a share of the korbanos, because that was learned from the pasuk regarding

mincha. It can't come to include a Kohen who always had a mum, because that is learned from the pasuk regarding chatas. Rather, we would think to only include a Kohen with a permanent mum. This pasuk comes to include even a Kohen with a temporary mum.

- **Q:** It would seem that it makes more sense to initially include a Kohen with a temporary mum rather than one with a permanent mum!? **A:** **R' Sheishes** said, we should reverse the words of the Braisa to say that. **R' Ashi** said, we would think that a Kohen with a temporary mum should not be allowed to eat, just like a Kohen who is tamei (which is also a temporary condition), and should only eat when the temporary condition has passed. The pasuk therefore teaches that he may eat and he gets a share of the korbanos.

KOL SHE'EINO RA'UY...

- **Q:** A baal mum is not fit to do the Avodah and yet he gets a share!? Also, does this mean that one who is fit to do the Avodah gets a share? A tamei Kohen is fit to do the Avodah of a korbon tzibbur and yet he doesn't get a share!? **A:** The Mishna means that a Kohen who is not fit to *eat* the korbon does not get a share of the korbanos.
 - **Q:** A minor Kohen is fit to eat and yet he does not get a share!? **A:** The Mishna teaches that one who is *not* fit to eat does *not* get a share. It should not be taken to teach that one who *is* fit to eat *does* get a share.
 - With this answer we can even say like we said originally, that one who is not fit to do the Avodah does not get a share. The fact that a tamei is fit and doesn't get a share is not problematic, because the Mishna is not teaching that someone who *is* fit would get a share. The fact that a baal mum gets a share is not problematic, because that is based on a pasuk that comes to include a baal mum.

AFILU TAMEI BISHAS ZRIKAS DAMIM...

- The Mishna suggests that if a Kohen was tahor by the zrika and tamei when the fats were burned he would get a share. Based on this, our Mishna does not follow **Abba Shaul**, who darshens a pasuk in a Braisa to teach that a Kohen only gets a share of the korbon if he was tahor from the zrika until the burning of the fats.
 - **Q:** **R' Ashi** asked, what if the Kohen was tahor at the time of the zrika and the time of the burning, but was tamei in between, would he get a share? **TEIKU**.
- **Rav** said, I learned the following halacha from **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** who said the following to himself in a bathroom. If a Kohen who is a tvul yom says to a tahor Kohen – “Give me a share of a Yisrael's mincha and I will eat it tonight when I am fully tahor”, the tahor Kohen can say to him, “If regarding a chatas, where if a Kohen who is not doing the Avodah that week brings his own chatas he may still do the Avodah and eat the meat, yet even if he is supposed to do the Avodah that week, if he is a tvul yom he would not be able to demand a share of someone else's chatas that is brought that week, then regarding a mincha, where a Kohen who brings his own mincha gets to eat none of it (it is fully burned), then certainly the tvul yom should get no share of a mincha!” The tvul yom could then respond, “You can push me away from a Yisrael's chatas, because you and I both have a stronger claim to our own chatas, but you can't use that to push me away from a mincha, since even you cannot eat your own mincha and are therefore no better than me!” The tahor Kohen could then say, “The pasuk regarding a mincha says “lakohen hamakriv osah lo sihiyeh” – if you come and do the Avodah you can come and eat the mincha” (and since he can't do the Avodah he can't eat the mincha). The Braisa then says, if the tvul yom asked for a share of a Yisrael's chatas the tahor Kohen can say, “If regarding a mincha, where I don't have a strong position, because I can't eat my own mincha, yet I can push you away from getting a share of a Yisrael's mincha, then regarding a chatas, where I have a strong position (I can do the Avodah and get my entire chatas even if it is not my week to do the Avodah) I can surely push you away from getting a share of a Yisrael's chatas.” The tvul yom can answer, “The reason you can push me away from a mincha is because, just like you, my position regarding my own mincha is weak. However, regarding a chatas, where like you, my position is strong, maybe you can't push me away!?” The tahor Kohen can say, “The pasuk regarding a chatas says “HaKohen hamichatei osah yochlena” – if you come and do the Avodah you can come and eat.” The Braisa then says, if the tvul yom asks for a share of the chazeh v'shok of a shelamim, the tahor Kohen can say, “If regarding a chatas, where you have a strong

position, I can push you away, then regarding a shelamim, where you have a weak position, because you can only get the chazek v'shok, I can surely push you away!" The tvul yom can answer, "You can push me away from a chatas, because my position is weak in that I cannot give it to my wife or slaves to eat, but maybe you can't push me away from the shelamim, since I can give it to my wife and slaves to eat!" The tahor Kohen can reply, "The pasuk says "laKohen hazoreik es dam hashelamim lo yihiyeh" – if you come and do the zrika you can get a portion and eat it." Based on all these arguments the tvul yom leaves with his arguments (they are all unsuccessful) and he has the mechusar kippurim on his right side and the onein on his left side (they would not be eligible to a share based on the same arguments that excluded the tvul yom).

- **Q: R' Achai** asked, the Braisa should have continued with one more case – where the tvul yom asks for a share of a bechor and the tahor Kohen eventually excludes him based on the pasuk that also talks of the zrika and the keeping of the meat, which teaches that only one who could do the zrika can get the meat!? **A: R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** would say that this is not included, because the pasuk regarding bechor doesn't say "ubisaram laKohen hazoreik", rather it says "ubisaram yihiyeh lach" – which suggests that it can go to any Kohen, even one who didn't do the zrika.
- **Q: Rababh bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said that one may not think of Torah in a bathroom, so how could **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** have done so!? **A:** He was considered an oneis, because he couldn't get his mind off of Torah.