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

How Impure?

The *Mishnah* stated that a *tvul yom – one who went to the mikvah this day* may not serve in the Temple, and invalidates any service that he performs. As a source, the *Gemara* cites a *Baraisa*, in which Rabbi Simai says that the verse provides a hint to this, when it says that the *Kohanim* must be "holy and not profane the name of Hashem." Since we already know that a truly impure *Kohen*, who has not even begun the purification process, invalidates the service, we must apply this extra verse to the case of a *tevul* yom.

The *Gemara* asks why we do not apply this verse to a *Kohen* who violates the prohibitions of destroying the edges of his beard and tearing hair in mourning, which are stated in the same verse.

The *Gemara* answers that this verse is already used to teach that a *tevul yom* who performs service is punished by heavenly death, as the term *chilul – profaning* is used in this verse, as well as in the verse prohibiting one who is impure from eating *terumah*. Just as someone impure who eats *terumah* is punished by heavenly death, so a *tevul yom* who performs the service. As this verse is applied to the case of a *tevul yom* regarding the punishment, we apply the invalidation indicated by the verse to a *tevul yom* case as well.

Rabbah explains why the verse had to enumerate three types of impurity which invalidate service: a *tameh – one who has not begun his purification*, a *tevul yom – one who has gone to the mikvah this day*, and *mechusar kippurim – one whose purification is only missing the necessary sacrifices:*

If the verse only enumerated...	It's different because...	Therefore, can't extend to
Tamei	He can make others impure	*Tevul yom*, *mechusar kippurim*
Tevul yom	He can't eat *terumah*	*Mechusar kippurim*
Mechusar kippurim	He needs an action to become pure	*Tevul yom*

The *Gemara* then asks why the verse could not have just enumerated two, leaving us to learn the third from them. If the verse had taught only *tevul yom* and *tamei*, we would have excluded *mechusar kippurim*, since only he may eat *terumah*. However, if the verse had taught only *mechusar kippurim* and *tamei*, couldn't we learn *tevul yom* from them?

The *Gemara* suggests that *tamei* and *mechusar kippurim* are each missing an action to remove the status (*mikvah for the tamei, the sacrifice for the mechusar kippurim*), while a *tevul yom* loses his status automatically.

L'zecher Nishmas HaRav Raphael Dov ben HaRav Yosef Yechezkel Marcus O"H

The *Gemara* rejects this, since a *mechusar kippurim* is still a weaker form of impurity, even if it can only be removed by an action.

The *Gemara* answers that Rabbah says that when one is at the *mechusar kippurim* status of a *zav* (*bodily emission*) impurity, although he is only missing the sacrifice, he is considered to still be fully impure as a *zav*, and not just a weaker level of impurity.

The *Gemara* suggests that the status of a *mechusar kippurim* is a debate of *Tannaim*, citing a *Baraisa* about the ashes of a *parah adumah* burned by an *onein – one who has to bury his close relative* or a *mechusar kippurim*. The first opinion considers these ashes both valid, while Yosef HaBavli says the ashes burned by a *mechusar kippurim* are invalid.

The *Gemara* suggests that they differ on the status of a *mechusar kippurim*, with the first opinion considering him fully impure, therefore invalidating the ashes, while Yosef HaBavli considers him a weak level of impurity, making the ashes valid.

The *Gemara* rejects this, saying that both can consider a *mechusar kippurim* to be fully impure, but they debate whether this invalidates the ashes he burns. The verse says that the "*pure one*" will sprinkle on the impure one, although the verse already referred to him as the "*pure one*." The repetition of this description indicates that only a basic level of purity is necessary, validating even a *tevul yom*. The first opinion applies this to a *tevul yom* of any type of impurity, even ones which need sacrifices for full purity, thereby validating a *mechusar kippurim* as well. Yosef HaBavli says that the *tevul yom* is only referring to a *tevul yom* of the impurity from a corpse, since this is the type of impurity the *parah* is used for. An *onein* and a *tevul yom* of impurity from an impure rodent are lower levels of impurity, and therefore can be learned from the *tevul yom* of impurity from a corpse. However, a *tevul yom* of *zav*, which require a sacrifice, is more severe, as the impurity is due to a bodily function, and cannot be learned from the *tevul yom* mentioned in relation to *parah*. (17a1 – 17b2)

Priestly Garments

The *Mishnah* stated that if a *Kohen* did the service without all the priestly garments, the service is invalid.

Rabbi Avuha quoted Rabbi Yochanan (*some say in the name of Rabbi Elazar berabbi Shimon*) saying that the source for this is the verse which states that Moshe should place the garments on the *Kohanim*, and it will be for them *kehuna l'chukas olam – kehuna for an everlasting decree*. This verse teaches that only when they are wearing the garments are they considered *Kohanim*, but they are otherwise considered non *Kohanim*, whose service is invalid.

The *Gemara* challenges this from another *Baraisa*, which provides another source for this invalidation. The *Baraisa* states that if one serves having drunk wine, the service is invalid, since the verse prohibits *Kohanim* from drinking wine and entering the Tabernacle, and then states that this will divide between the holy and profane. This sequence implies that service after drinking wine is profane, i.e., invalid. The *Baraisa* continues to say that this also applies to one who serves without the priestly garments or without having washed his hands and feet, since the word *chukah – decree* is used in both these cases, and is also used in the prohibition of serving having drunk wine.

The *Gemara* answers that the verse about drinking wine only refers to services that a non *Kohen* who serves is punished by heavenly death, while the verse cited earlier

extends this to invalidate any service, even if a non *Kohen* who performs it is not punished by heavenly death. (17b 2– 18a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Mechusar Kippurim of Zav like Zav

The *Gemara* says that Rabbah holds that *mechusar kippurim* of *zav* is like a *zav*, and not a weaker form of impurity. The Rishonim debate what exactly is the ramification of this classification. Rashi says that his relation to sanctified items is the same as a *zav*. Just as a *zav* who eats meat of sacrifices is punished by kares, so a *mechusar kippurim* is punished by *kares*, and just as a *zav* makes sanctified food fully impure by touching them, so does a *mechusar kippurim*.

Tosfos (17b kasavar) raises objections to Rashi's position, and cites Rabbeinu Chaim, who says that the ramification is whether a *mechusar kippurim* is treated like a *zav* relative to the *pesach* sacrifice. If a *pesach* sacrifice is offered in an impure setting (*i.e., if most of the nation is impure*), a *zav* still may not eat it. If a *mechusar kippurim* of a *zav* is like a *zav*, he also may not eat from this *pesach*.

Tevul Yom for Parah Adumah

The *Gemara* states that the verse explicitly allows a *tevul yom* to burn the *parah* into ashes. Tosfos (17b sarfa) notes that the *Mishnah* in Chagigah states that even the clothes of those who purified themselves for meat of sacrifices is considered impure for the purposes of the *parah*, since we treat it more carefully. These clothes would seem to be much purer than a *tevul yom*, but yet they are impure for *parah*.

Tosfos suggests that perhaps the Sages prohibited a *tevul yom* for *parah*, or perhaps the issue with the clothes is not impurity per se, but lack of oversight, which is different than a *tevul yom*, who has gone to the *mikvah*, and fully removed his impurity.

Tosfos finally notes that the *Gemara* says that the *Kohen Gadol* performing the *parah* service was intentionally impurified by contact with a *tevul yom* to prove to the Sadducees that a *tevul yom* is valid for *parah*. Even if the Sages prohibited a *tevul yom*, Tosfos explains that the *tevul yom* used to impurify the *Kohen Gadol* was not a true *tevul yom*, but rather other *Kohanim* who had not purified themselves specifically for *parah*. Such *Kohanim* would be considered impure for *parah*, from Rabbinic law, and therefore were akin to a *tevul yom* for this purpose.

To Serve with One's Own Powers

The Midrash (Vayikra Rabah, *parashah* 12:1) says in the name of Rabbi Yishmael that Nadav and Avihu were punished because they entered the Sanctuary after they drank wine. The *Sefas Emes* zt"l says that even according to the simple meaning, this does not mean that we should disdain wine, which makes a person rejoice and opens the wells of wisdom. Rather, the complaint was that a *Kohen*, Hashem's representative, should serve out of inner arousal without adding external causes, such as wine or the like.

Are a Kohen's Garments a need for the Kohen or a need for the Service of the Temple?

Our *Gemara* explains that a *Kohen* must wear his special garments (*bigdei kehunah*) during his service in the Temple for if not, his service is disqualified. If we examine the *halachos* of *bigdei kehunah*, we find that we can define the obligation to wear them in two ways: (1) The ***Kohen*** needs the garments to be fit for his service. (2) The **service of the Temple** needs the garments. In other words, it could be that a *Kohen* needs the garments as they qualify him for serving in the Temple and it could be that he is missing nothing: he is a *Kohen* fit for service but in conformity with

the rules for serving in the Temple, the service must be performed only in *bigdei kehunah.* The garments, therefore, are not needed by the *Kohen* but by the service. These two definitions are not contradictory: the garments could be needed for the *Kohen* **and** for the service.

From our *sugya*, which says "**when their garments are on them, their *kehunah* is on them**," we learn that the garments are needed to qualify a *Kohen* for his service in the Temple (the first possibility). But we still have to clarify if the garments are part of the *halachos* of the service of the Temple. In his *Asvan D'oraisa* (*kelal* 19), HaGaon Rav Yosef Engel zt"l considers this question and sharpens it with the following example: a *Kohen hedyot* (ordinary *Kohen*) wears four garments (trousers, a shirt, a belt and a hat) while the *Kohen Gadol* wears eight (trousers, a shirt, a belt, a coat, the *eifod*, the *choshen*, a turban and the *tzitz*).

A *Kohen hedyot* who serves on Yom Kippur: What about a *Kohen hedyot*, wearing his four garments, who performs the service of the *Kohen Gadol* on **Yom Kippur**? If the garments are required for the *halachos* of serving in the Temple, the Torah's command that only the *Kohen Gadol* should perform the services on Yom Kippur includes the imperative that eight garments are needed from there. Therefore, this *Kohen hedyot* is punishable by death, as our *sugya* explains about a *Kohen* lacking any of his garments. However, if the garments are a requirement for the *Kohen*, this *Kohen* wore all his garments and only transgressed the positive *mitzvah* that the service of Yom Kippur should be performed only by a *Kohen Gadol.*

DAILY MASHAL

Rav Engel solves this question from that cited in Midrash Rabah about Nadav and Avihu, that they were killed because they did not wear a *me'il* (coat), one of the garments of the *Kohen Gadol*, when they offered incense in the *kodesh hakodoshim* and the *Rosh* comments (Responsa, *kelal* 13:21) that though they were not *kohanim gedolim*, their offering incense required them to wear a *me'il* as that is a service of the *Kohen Gadol*! We see, then, that the garments are needed for the *halachos* of the service in the Temple and since the service of the incense was given to the *Kohen Gadol*, its service requires eight garments.

He also offers support for his opinion from the *Gemara* further on (88b), which explains that *bigdei kehunah* atone, detailing which sins are atoned for by each garment. If the *bigdei kehunah* are needed by a *Kohen* only to qualify him to serve in the Temple, there is no reason that they should atone for sins. However, if a *Kohen* must wear them because the *halachos* of the Temple determine that they must be performed only in *bigdei kehunah*, it is obvious that the garments also atone as the services of the Temple – the sacrifices and the like – atone for sins. (Rav Engel also considered this question in his *Beis HaOtzar* [II, *kelal* 10] and quotes *Or HaChayim* on Shemos 28:2, indicating that, in his opinion, the garments are not a requirement for the service. See HaGaon Rav Yitzchak Zeev, who thus explained Rambam's opinion in *Sefer HaMitzvos*, 33, that donning the *bigdei kehunah* is counted as a *mitzvah* in itself).

L'zecher Nishmas HaRav Raphael Dov ben HaRav Yosef Yechezkel Marcus O"H