

17 Tishrei 5778  
Oct. 7, 2017



Sanhedrin Daf 83

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

**Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h**

**Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

### ***Wrong Way to Offer***

Rav Sheishes is of the opinion that a *Kohen* who serves in the Beis Hamikdash while *tamei* is not liable to death by the hand of Heaven.

The *Gemora* asks from a *Mishna*: If one pours the oil on the meal offering, mixes it with the flour, breaks up the meal offering cakes into pieces, salts the offering, waves it, brings it, sets the show bread on the table, prepares the lamps, takes off the handful of flour from the meal offering or receives the blood — if he did any of these outside the Temple, he is not liable to *kares* (for *kares* is only for concluding services, such as slaughtering, burning or sprinkling outside of the Temple). Nor is punishment incurred for any of these acts done by a non-*Kohen*, nor while a *Kohen* was *tamei*, nor if he was missing vestments, nor if he performed any of these services without washing his hands and feet first. This implies that if someone burns an offering outside of the Beis Hamikdash that he is liable! This must mean that he is liable to death (at the hands of Heaven – and this would be true if a *Kohen* performed this service while *tamei*; this is contrary to Rav Sheishes’ viewpoint)!!?

The *Gemora* answers: No, it is just a negative warning.

The *Gemora* asks: Does this mean that the warning for a non-*Kohen* to sacrifice a *korban* in the Beis Hamikdash is

also just a negative warning? Doesn’t the verse say: *And the noon-Kohen who will sacrifice will be killed?*

The *Gemora* answers: Each has its own liability. [For serving while *tamei*, there is a mere prohibition; for a non-*Kohen* who serves – death.]

The *Gemora* asks: Being that burning an offering is only a negative warning, it must be that pouring or mixing a flour offering is not even a negative warning. However, doesn’t the *braisa* state: What is the source of the warning against pouring or mixing (a flour offering)? The verse says: *They will be holy...and they will not profane.* [This shows that pouring and mixing are also negative prohibitions.]

The *Gemora* answers: This derivation is Rabbinic in nature, and merely an *asmachta* (a Scriptural support for a Rabbinical decree).

The *Gemora* asks a question from a *braisa*. The *braisa* states: These are the ones who are killed. The *braisa* includes a *Kohen* who served in the Beis Hamikdash while he was *tamei*. [This is a question on Rav Sheishes who said that he was not liable to be killed.] The *Gemora* concludes that this is indeed a strong refutation.

The *Gemora* discusses the aforementioned *braisa*. These are the ones who are killed: One who eats untithed produce, an impure *Kohen* who ate pure *terumah*, and a

non-Kohen who ate terumah. The following who served in the Beis Hamikdash are also liable to be killed: A non-Kohen, Kohen who was *tamei*, Kohen who was a *tevul yom* (one who was *tamei*, but has immersed himself in a *mikvah*; he is considered a *tevul yom* until nightfall), one who lacked the priestly vestments, one who lacked atonement, one who did not wash his hands or feet, one who was drunk or had grown his hair too long. However, one who did not have a *bris milah*, an *onein* (one whose close relative passed away and has not been buried yet), and one who was sitting (while serving) are not liable to be killed for serving in the Beis Hamikdash, although they have transgressed a negative prohibition. If a Kohen serves with a blemish, Rebbe says he is liable to be killed, while the *Chachamim* say he has transgressed a negative prohibition. If a person purposely benefited from *hekdesh*, Rebbe says he is liable to be killed, while the *Chachamim* say he has transgressed a negative prohibition.

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know that one who eats *tevel* (untithed produce) is liable to be killed?

Shmuel says in the name of Rabbi Elozar: The verse says: *And they will not profane the holy items of bnei yisroel that they will lift up for Hashem*. This verse is referring to things that will be lifted up (but have not yet been lifted up, meaning untithed grain). We derive a *gezeirah shavah* (one of the thirteen principles of Biblical hermeneutics; it links two similar words from dissimilar verses in the Torah) “*chilul-chilul*” from *terumah*. Just as a Kohen is liable to be killed for eating *terumah* while he was *tamei*, so too, one is liable to be killed for eating untithed grain.

The *Gemora* asks: Why don't we derive a *gezeirah shavah* “*chilul-chilul*” from *nosar* (sacrificial meat that has been leftover beyond the time that the Torah

designated for its consumption)? We could say that just as a person is liable to receive *kares* for eating *nosar*, so too one is liable to receive *kares* for eating untithed grain!

The *Gemora* answers: It is more understandable to derive from *terumah*, as *terumah* and untithed grain both involve *terumah*, they do not apply outside of *Eretz Yisroel*, each can become permitted, they both have the word “*chilul*” stated in the plural, apply to fruit, and *piggul* (a *korban* whose *avodah* was done with the intention that it would be eaten after its designated time) and *nosar* do not apply to them.

The *Gemora* asks: On the contrary! We should derive from *nosar*, as both *nosar* and untithed grain are problematic foods (as opposed to *terumah* which is an *uplifted food*) and they do not become permitted to be eaten to one who immerses in a *mikvah* (as opposed to *terumah* for a Kohen).

The *Gemora* answers: *Terumah* has more in common with untithed grain than *nosar*, and therefore it is appropriate to derive from *terumah*.

Ravina says: It is better to derive a “*chilul*” stated in the plural from another such word, as opposed to “*chilul*” by *nosar* stated in the singular.

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know that an impure Kohen who eats pure *terumah* is liable to be killed?

Shmuel says: How do we know that an impure Kohen who eats pure *terumah* is liable to be killed by Heaven? The verse states: *And they (impure Kohanim) will guard My guarding, and they will not bear a sin because of it etc.*



The *Gemora* deduces: He is only liable if he eats pure *terumah*, not impure *terumah*. [What is the source for this law?]

This is as Shmuel states in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: How do we know that if an impure *Kohen* eats impure *terumah* that he is not liable to be killed? The verse says: *And they will die because of it, for they have profaned it.* This excludes *terumah* that had already been profaned (*impure*).

The *braisa* stated: A non-*Kohen* that eats *terumah* is liable to be killed.

Rav says: A non-*Kohen* that eats *terumah* is liable to receive lashes.

Rav Kahana and Rav Assi said to Rav: Why don't you say he is liable to be killed, as the verse states: *And all non-Kohanim should not eat kodesh?* [The verse continues that if they do they receive death.]

He answered: *I am Hashem Who makes them holy* splits up the verse (*and the death is only referring to impure Kohanim*).

The *Gemora* asks a question from the *braisa*. The *braisa* states: A non-*Kohen* that eats *terumah* is liable to be killed.

The *Gemora* asks: Are you asking a question on Rav from the *braisa*? Rav is a *Tanna*, and therefore can argue on the *braisa*.

A non-*Kohen* who serves in the Beis Hamikdash is liable to be killed, as the verse says: *And the non-Kohen who serves will be killed.*

An impure *Kohen* who serves in the Beis Hamikdash is liable to be killed, as Rav Chiya bar Avin asked from Rav Yosef. He asked: How do we know that an impure *Kohen* who serves in the Beis Hamikdash is liable to be killed? He answered: The verse says: *Talk to Aharon and his sons, and they should stay away from the holy items of Bnei Yisroel, and they will not profane My holy name.* We derive a *gezeirah shavah* "*chilul-chilul*" from *terumah*. Just as a *Kohen* is liable to be killed for eating *terumah* when impure, so too, an impure *Kohen* is liable to be killed for serving in the Beis Hamikdash.

The *Gemora* asks: Why don't we derive a *gezeirah shavah* "*chilul-chilul*" from *nosar*? We could say that just as a person is liable to receive *kares* for eating *nosar*, so too, an impure *Kohen* is liable to receive *kares* for serving in the Beis Hamikdash!

The *Gemora* answers: It is more understandable to derive from *terumah*, as *terumah* and impure service both involve the person being unfit, impurity, the ability to rectify the situation by immersing in a *mikvah*, and that the word "*chilul*" is stated by both in the plural form.

The *Gemora* asks: On the contrary! We should derive from *nosar*, as both *nosar* and impure service deal with *kodoshim*, things brought inside the Beis Hamikdash, potential *piggul*, and potential *nosar*!

The *Gemora* answers: It is better to derive a "*chilul*" stated in the plural from another such word, as opposed to "*chilul*" by *nosar* stated in the singular.

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know that a *tevul yom* who serves in the Beis Hamikdash is liable to be killed? The *braisa* says: Rabbi Simai says: Where do we see a hint that a *tevul yom* who does the service in the Beis

Hamikdash has made the service invalid? The verse says: *They will be holy to their G-d and they will not profane etc.* Being that this verse is not necessary to teach the law regarding an impure *Kohen* who served, as this is derived from the verse: *And they should separate themselves*, it can be used to teach that a *tevul yom* who serves is liable to be killed. We derive "*chilul-chilul*" from death. Just as a *Kohen* is liable to be killed for eating *terumah* when impure, so too, a *tevul yom* is liable to be killed for serving in the Beis Hamikdash.

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know that a *Kohen* who serves without the required priestly vestments is liable to be killed?

Rabbi Avahu says in the name of Rabbi Yochanan, and some say in the name of Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Shimon: *And you will belt them with a belt.* This implies that when their priestly garments are on them, they are considered *Kohanim* (regarding the *avodah*). If they do not have their garments on them, they are not considered *Kohanim*. They are like non-*Kohanim*, who are liable to be killed if they serve in the Beis Hamikdash.

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know that a *Kohen* who lacks atonement (*i.e. bringing korbanos to atone for him in order to allow him to serve again*) who serves in the Beis Hamikdash is liable to be killed?

Rav Huna answers: The verse says: *And the Kohen will atone for him and make her pure.* This implies that before she was impure (*because she lacked atonement*). Accordingly, a person who lacks atonement is considered impure, and we know that an impure *Kohen* who serves is liable to be killed.

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know that a *Kohen* who serves in the Beis Hamikdash without washing his hands

and feet is liable to be killed? This is as the verse says: *When they come to the Ohel Moed, they will wash in water and they will not die.*

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know that a *Kohen* who serves in the Beis Hamikdash when drunk (*i.e. having drunk a revi'is of wine*) is liable to be killed? The verse states: *Wine and any intoxicating beverage do not drink etc.*

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know that a *Kohen* who serves in the Beis Hamikdash after not getting a haircut for more than thirty days is liable to be killed? The verse says: *Their hair they should not shave (completely) and they should not let their hair grow wild.* The verse also states afterwards: *And they should not drink wine.* Growing long hair is compared to drinking wine. Just as drinking wine and serving is punished with death, so too growing long hair and serving is punished with death. (82b – 83b)