



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

**Mishnah**

The daughter of a male *chalal* is forbidden to the *Kehunah* forever. A *Yisroel* who marries a *chalalah*, his daughter is permitted to the *Kehunah*. A *chalal* who married the daughter of a *Yisroel*, his daughter is forbidden to the *Kehunah*.

Rabbi Yehudah says: The daughter of a male convert is like the daughter of a male *chalal*.

Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov says: If a *Yisroel* married a female convert, his daughter is permitted to the *Kehunah*, and if a convert married the daughter of a *Yisroel*, his daughter is permitted to the *Kehunah*, but if a male convert married a female convert, his daughter is forbidden to the *Kehunah*. The *halachah* is the same to a convert and to a freed slave, even unto ten generations - until his mother is from a *Yisroel*. Rabbi Yosi says: Even if a male convert married a female convert, his daughter is permitted to the *Kehunah*. (77a1)

Why [state], forever? — I might have thought it should be comparable to an Egyptian and an Edomite: just as there, after three generations [the prohibition is lifted], so here too after three generations [the daughter is fit for the *Kehunah*]. Therefore, we are informed [otherwise]. (77a1 – 77a2)

**Chalal - Chalalah**

The *Tanna* of the *Mishnah* holds that the daughter of a male *chalal* is forbidden to the *Kehunah*, but the daughter of a

*chalalah* (who married a *Yisroel*) is permitted to the *Kehunah*.

How do we know it? — Said Rabbi Yochanan in the name of Rabbi Yishmael: Here it is stated: and he shall not profane his offspring among his people; and there it is stated: A husband shall not make himself tamei, among his people: just as there males but not females, so here too, males but not females. - If so, let a Kohen Gadol's daughter [from a widow] be permitted [to marry a Kohen]? — Is it then written: '[and he shall not profane] his son'? 'His offspring' is written, viz., he shall not profane his offspring among his people. - Then let the daughter of his son be permitted? — It is written: he shall not profane his offspring: [hence] his offspring is compared to himself: just as his own daughter is unfit, so is his son's daughter unfit. — Then let his daughter's daughter [too] be forbidden? — If so, what is effected by the *gezeirah shavah*?

[The *halachos* that emerge are as follows: Any child born from a forbidden union (*such as a widow with a Kohen Gadol*) are *chalalim*. A *chalal's* male children can transmit the state of *chalalus* to the next generation, but his female children cannot.] (77a2 – 77a3)

The *Mishnah* had stated: If a *chalal* marries the daughter of a *Yisrael*, his daughter is unfit. - But that is stated in the first clause: The daughter of a male *chalal* is unfit for the *kehunah* forever? — Because the former clause teaches: If a *yisrael* marries a *chalalah*, the latter clause also states: If a *chalal* marries the daughter of a *Yisrael*. (77a3)

The *Mishnah* had stated that the daughter of a *chalal* is forbidden to the *Kehunah*.

The *Gemora* comments: This is unlike the opinion of Rabbi Dostai the son of Yehudah, who holds that just as a Jewish man is a *mikvah* of purity for a *chalalah*, so too, a Jewish woman is a *mikvah* of purity for a *chalal*. [*He holds that the daughter of a chalal is not disqualified from the Kehunah.*]

What is Rabbi Dostai the son of Yehudah's reason? — Scripture states: He shall not profane his offspring among his people: he profanes [his offspring] among one people, but not among two peoples. (77a3)

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: It is written: He shall not profane his offspring. This teaches us that if a *Kohen* cohabits with a forbidden woman, the child is a *chalal*. That the woman becomes a *chalalah* is derived from the following *kal vachomer*: If the child, who did not commit any sin, becomes a *chalal*; she, who did commit a sin, should certainly become a *chalalah*. - Let he himself [the *Kohen*] refute it: he committed a sin, yet he is not profaned! As for himself, that is because he is not profaned in all other cases; will you say [the same] of her, seeing that she is profaned in all other cases? And should you desire to object, [then one can answer,] Scripture states: He shall not profane his offspring, [which means]: This one shall not become profaned, who was [originally] fit and is [now] profaned.

What is meant by, 'and should you desire to object?' — [This:] and should you say, one can refute [it thus]: as for his offspring, that is because he is conceived in sin; [therefore] Scripture states: He shall not profane his offspring: this one shall not become profaned, who was [originally] fit and is [now] profaned. (77a3 – 77a4)

The *Baraisa* states that a *chalalah* is a girl born from one of the unfit ones. - What is meant by unfit ones? Shall we say, unfit for him? But what of the one who takes back his divorced wife, though she is unfit for him, yet her children are fit, as it is written: she is an abomination: 'she is an

abomination but her children are no abomination! — Said Rav Yehudah: This is its meaning: What is a *chalalah*? — One who was born of a priestly disqualification. Only one who was born [of such a forbidden union], but not one who was not born [thus]? - But what of a widow, a divorced woman or a *zonah*, who were not born [thus], and yet [each] is a *chalalah*. — *Rabbah* explains: A *chalalah* can also be a widow, divorcee or *zonah* (who cohabits with a *Kohen*). The *Baraisa* is the "mentioned" *chalalah* who was never (in her lifetime) fit for *Kehunah* (i.e. she was born a *chalalah*).

What is the meaning of 'mentioned?' — Rav Idi bar Avin explains the "mentioned" *chalalah*. The girl born from a union of a *Kohen* with a woman forbidden to the *Kehunah* is the *chalalah* mentioned in the Torah who does not need any Rabbinic explanation at all. (77a4)

### Multiple Prohibitions

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: If a *Kohen Gadol* cohabits with a widow, a widow, a widow (*the Gemora will explain this*), he receives only one set of lashes. If a *Kohen* cohabits with a divorcee, a divorcee, a divorcee (*the Gemora will explain this*), he receives only one set of lashes. If he cohabits with a widow, a divorcee, a *zonah* and a *chalalah*, the *halachah* is as follows: If it happened in that precise order (*first she became a widow, then a divorcee etc.*), he receives lashes for each and every transgression. However, if she became a *zonah*, then a *chalalah*, then a divorcee, and then a widow, he will only receive one set of lashes.

The master had stated in the *Baraisa*: If a *Kohen Gadol* cohabits with a widow, a widow, a widow, he receives only one set of lashes. What is the case? If he cohabited with Reuven's widow, Shimon's widow and Levi's widow, why would he be liable only once? Each one of them is a different entity, and they have three different titles! [*He should receive three sets of lashes!?*] Perhaps the *Baraisa* means that he cohabited with one widow three times. But what exactly is the case? If there was no warning in between each one, it is obvious that he is liable only once (*for one cannot*

receive lashes unless he was duly warned beforehand)!? And if he was warned before each and every time, why is he liable only for one? Did we not learn in a *Mishnah* that if a *nazir* was drinking wine the entire day, he will be liable only once (*he will receive lashes only one time*). If they told him, “Do not drink,” “Do not drink,” but he kept on drinking, he will be liable for each and every time (*that he drank after he was warned*). Rather, the *Baraisa* must be referring to a case where he cohabited with the widow of Reuven, who was also the widow of Shimon, who was also the widow of Levi. Although she is forbidden under three different titles, he is liable only once, for she is one entity. (77a5 – 77b1)

The *Baraisa* had stated: If he cohabits with a widow, a divorcee, a *zonah* and a *chalalah*, the *halachah* is as follows: If it happened in that precise order (*first she became a widow, then a divorcee etc.*), he receives lashes for each and every transgression. However, if she became a *zonah*, then a *chalalah*, then a divorcee, and then a widow, he will only receive one set of lashes.

The *Gemora* asks: What does this *Tanna* hold? If he holds that one prohibition can take effect upon another preexisting prohibition, he should be liable for all four transgressions even if it happened in the reverse order!? And if he holds that one prohibition cannot take effect upon another preexisting prohibition, then he should only be liable for one transgression even if it happened in that precise order!?

Rava answers: This *Tanna* maintains that one prohibition cannot take effect upon another preexisting prohibition; however, he holds that it can take effect if the second prohibition is more extensive than the first one (*i.e. if it applies to more people than the first one, or if it is more restrictive than the first one*). When this woman was a widow, she was only forbidden to a *Kohen Gadol*, but she was permitted to an ordinary *Kohen*. When she becomes a divorcee, we say the following: Since we have added a prohibition with respect to an ordinary *Kohen*, it takes effect on the *Kohen Gadol* as well. When she becomes a *chalalah*,

she now becomes forbidden to eat *terumah*. However, the *Gemora* asks: What new prohibition takes effect when she becomes a *zonah*? Rav Chana bar Rav Katina answers: It is because the title “*zonah*” disqualifies her even to a *Yisroel*. (77b1 – 77b2)

The following *Baraisa* was taught before Rav Sheishes: Whoever is included in the verse: *And a Kohen Gadol shall take a virgin* is included in the verse: *(A Kohen Gadol) shall not take (a widow, a divorcee, a chalalah or a zonah)*. [*If the woman was permitted to him as a virgin, she can become forbidden to him as a widow, divorcee etc.*] However, if she is not included in the verse: *And a Kohen Gadol shall take a virgin*, she is not included in the verse: *(A Kohen Gadol) shall not take (a widow, a divorcee, a chalalah or a zonah)*. This would exclude a *Kohen Gadol* who cohabited with his widowed sister (*for she was not included in the first verse*).

Rav Sheishes said to him: According to which *Tanna* does this *Baraisa* follow? It reflects the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who holds that one prohibition cannot take effect upon another preexisting prohibition, for we learned in a *Baraisa*: Rabbi Shimon says that one who eats *neveilah* (*carcass of an animal that was not slaughtered properly*) on *Yom Kippur* is exempt from bringing a *korban chatas* (*for eating on Yom Kippur, since it was forbidden from beforehand*). For the *Chachamim* hold that one prohibition can take effect upon another preexisting prohibition (*and therefore the widow prohibition should take effect upon the sister prohibition*).

The *Gemora* rejects this reasoning: The *Baraisa* can reflect the *Chachamim's* opinion as well, for they only said that one prohibition can take effect upon another preexisting prohibition if a stringent prohibition (*Yom Kippur*) is taking effect upon a lenient prohibition (*neveilah*). However, they agree that a lenient prohibition (*widow, which is a mere negative prohibition*) cannot take effect upon a stringent prohibition (*sister, where the punishment is kares*).

The *Gemora* cites a different version of the discussion: Rav Sheishes said to him: According to which *Tanna* does this

*Baraisa* follow? It reflects the opinion of the *Chachamim*, who hold that one prohibition can take effect upon another preexisting prohibition. For they only said that one prohibition can take effect upon another preexisting prohibition if a stringent prohibition (*Yom Kippur*) is taking effect upon a lenient prohibition (*neveilah*). However, they agree that a lenient prohibition (*widow, which is a mere negative prohibition*) cannot take effect upon a stringent prohibition (*sister, where the punishment is kares*). However, according to Rabbi Shimon, there would be no novelty in that which the *Baraisa* is teaching, for if a stringent prohibition cannot take effect upon a preexisting lenient prohibition, then a lenient prohibition can certainly not take effect upon a stringent prohibition!

The *Gemora* rejects this reasoning: The *Baraisa* can reflect Rabbi Shimon's opinion as well, for perhaps the prohibitions regarding *Kohanim* are different (*and even a lenient prohibition can take effect upon a stringent one*). The *Baraisa* teaches us that this is not so. (77b2 – 77b3)

### **Zonah - Chalalah**

Rav Pappa asked Abaye: If a *Yisroel* cohabits with his sister, we know that she becomes a *zonah*; but does she become a *chalalah* as well? Do we say [it follows] a *kal vachomer*: if one becomes a *chalalah* by those who are forbidden to her by [only] negative injunctions, how much more so by those who are forbidden on pain of *kares*. Or perhaps, a *chalalah* results from a *Kehunah* prohibition only? — He answered: A *chalalah* results from a *Kehunah* prohibition only.

Rava said: How do we know this ruling stated by the Rabbis [that] a *chalalah* is only from a *Kehunah* prohibition? Because it was taught: Let a divorced woman not be stated in reference to a *Kohen Gadol*, and it could be inferred through a *kal vachomer* from an ordinary *Kohen*; for I would argue: If she is forbidden to an ordinary *Kohen*, can there be a question of a *Kohen Gadol*? Why then is it stated? [To teach]: Just as a divorced woman is distinct from *zonah* and *chalalah* in respect of an ordinary *Kohen*, so is she distinct in

reference to a *Kohen Gadol*. [But] that is obvious: is it [the sanctity of a *Kohen Gadol*] in any way diminished? But [it is rather to teach] just as a divorced woman is distinct from *zonah* and a *chalalah* in respect of an ordinary *Kohen*, so is a widow distinct from a divorced woman, a *chalalah* and a *zonah* in respect of a *Kohen Gadol*. Why is *chalalah* stated? [To show that] *chalalah* results from a *Kehunah* prohibition only. Why is *zonah* stated? — *Zonah* is stated here; and it is also stated there: just as here, his offspring is profaned, so there too, his offspring is profaned. (77b3 – 77b4)

### **DAILY MASHAL**

The *Moshav Z'keinim* says that the reason the Torah prohibited a *Kohein Godol* from marrying a widow, who is allowed to a regular *Kohen*, is because if he were allowed to marry a widow there is a fear that when he is doing the service of the incense on *Yom Kippur* in the Holy of Holies, where his entreaties are readily fulfilled by Hashem, he might pray that the husband of a woman in whom he is interested in marrying, should die. This is a most startling "chidush," as he is involved in such holy service on the holiest day of the year in the holiest location in the world. As well, he is not assured that the woman who might be widowed would agree to become his wife. We see from the words of the *Moshav Z'keinim* that in spite of all this, there is a fear of his having such matters on his mind. This might be a new insight into why we read the parshah of forbidden marriage partners during the "minchah" prayers of *Yom Kippur*.