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

Disqualifying the Intoxicated

The *Gemora* asks: We have found that one who lacks priestly vestments (*invalidates a service, even those services where a non-Kohen would not incur the death penalty*); how do we know regarding one who has drunk wine (*that he invalidates even such a service*)?

The *Gemara* answers: We derive it through a *gezeirah shavah* using the word *a law* (*written here*), *a law* written by the case of one who lacks vestments.

The *Gemara* asks: But the *Tanna* learns the law of one who lacks vestments (*that he invalidates the service*) from that of one who drank wine?

The *Gemara* answers by explaining the *Baraisa* to mean as follows: How do we know that there are no distinctions between one who lacks vestments and one who drank wine or who serves without washing his hands and feet (*and just as the invalidation of one who lacks vestments applies to all avodos, so too the invalidation of the other applies to all avodos, not only the four concluding avodos*)? The *Baraisa* answers: it is because *a law* is written in respect of each, to serve as a *gezeirah shavah*.

The *Gemara* asks: Then what is the need of the verse 'in order to distinguish'?

The *Gemara* answers: It is used to teach the practice of Rav, for Rav would not place an announcer at his side (*who announced his rulings to the public*) from the beginning of the Festival (*after the first festive meal*) until the following day, on account of intoxication.

The *Gemara* asks: But still, is it derived from this verse? Surely it is derived from a different verse, as taught in the following *Baraisa*: *And the sons of Aaron the Kohen shall put* (*fire upon the Altar*), which implies that the *avodos* shall be done in his priestly state (*while wearing his vestments*). This teaches us that if a *Kohen Gadol* wore the vestments of an ordinary *Kohen* and performed an *avodah*, his service is invalid!?

The *Gemara* answers: If we would derive from that verse, I would argue that it applies only to a service which is essential for atonement, but not to a service which is not essential for atonement.

The *Gemara* asks: But still, is it derived from this verse? Surely it is derived from a different verse, as taught in the following *Baraisa*: *And Aaron's sons, the Kohanim, shall arrange the pieces* etc., which implies that the *avodos* shall be done in his priestly state (*while wearing his vestments*). This teaches us that if a *Kohen Gadol* wore the vestments of an ordinary *Kohen* and performed an *avodah*, his service is invalid!?

The *Gemara* answers: If we would derive from that verse, I would argue that it applies only to an insufficiency of vestments (*where he is wearing less than required*), but not to an excess (*of vestments*). The verse therefore informs us that it is not so. (18a1 – 18a3)

Perfect Fit

The *Gemara* cites a *Baraisa*: If the priestly vestments were dragging on the floor, or did not reach the floor (*because they were too short*), or were old and worn out, and the *Kohen* performed the service in them, his service is valid. But if he put on two pairs of pants, two belts, or if he was missing one

garment, or if he wore one too many, or if he had a bandage on a wound in his flesh under his garment, or if they were dirty (*with mud*), or torn, and he performed the service in them, his service is invalid.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: If the priestly vestments were dragging on the floor, they are valid; if they did not reach the floor, they are invalid.

The *Gemara* asks: But it was taught in the *Baraisa* that if they do not reach the floor, they are valid!?

Rami bar Chama answers: There is no difficulty, for the *Baraisa* refers to a case where (*they were the proper sixe, but*) he hitches them up by the belt, and Shmuel is referring to a case where from the outset they did not reach the floor.

Rav said: The garments are invalid in both of those cases.

Rav Huna visited Argiza. His host's son asked the following contradiction to him: How could Shmuel say that if the priestly vestments were dragging on the floor, they are valid, and if they did not reach the floor, they are invalid when the *Baraisa* taught that if they do not reach the floor, they are valid? Rav Huna said he to him: Disregard that *Baraisa* from here, for Rami bar Chama has already answered it. But the difficulty is according to Rav (*for he rules against the Baraisa by saying that garments are invalid if they are dragging on the floor*)! And should you answer that when the *Baraisa* said that the garments were dragging (*and they are valid*), it means that they were hitched up by the belt (*to the proper length*), (*and it is valid*) for the belt cuts off the extra material; but then there is a difficulty about the garments which do not reach the floor (*for the Baraisa rules that are valid and Rav contradicts this*)?

Rabbi Zeira answers: Rav understands the *Baraisa* to be referring to one case: Dragging garments which are hitched up by the belt are valid.

Rabbi Yirmiyah of Difti said: Regarding dragging garments which were not lifted up, there is a dispute amongst the *Tannaim*, for it was taught in a *Baraisa*: (*You shall make twisted cords*) *upon the four corners of your garment*. This teaches us that a garment with four corners needs *tzitzis*, but not one of three. But perhaps it is excluding five!? When it says: *with which you cover yourself*, a five-cornered garment is included. Evidently, the word "*four*" is excluding three. The *Baraisa* explains that a five-cornered garment is included because four is included in five, and a three-cornered garment is excluded because four does not include three.

Now, another *Baraisa* taught: *upon the four corners of your garment*: *four* but not three, and *four* but not five.

Surely, they disagree on the following point: one master holds that the additional corner is counted as if it is existent, and the other master holds that it is as if it is non-existent!?

The *Gemara* rejects this interpretation and explains that they all agree that that which is additional is counted as if it is existent, but here it is different, because the Torah includes (*a five-cornered garment*) in the verse: *with which you cover yourself*.

The *Gemara* asks: And what does the other *Tanna* use that verse for?

The *Gemara* answers: He requires it for that which was taught in the following *Baraisa*: *and you shall see it*. This excludes a night garment (*from the requirement of tzitzis*). It does not excludes a blind man's garment, for it says: *with which you cover yourself*. The *Baraisa* explains that a blind man's garment is included because it can be seen by others, and a night garment is excluded because it is not seen by others. (18a3 – 18b3)

Bahd

The *Gemara* cites a *Baraisa*: The word "*bahd*" teaches us that the priestly garments must be made of linen; they must be new; they must be made of twisted thread; the threads must be sixfold; non-consecrated garments must not be worn together with them.

Abaye asked Rav Yosef: Did we not learn in a *Baraisa* that old and worn garments are valid? [*Why is this Baraisa stating that the garments must be new?*]

Rav Yosef responded to him: And how can this *Baraisa* derive from the word "*bahd*" that the thread must be sixfold, when in truth the word actually implies that each thread should be separate?

Rather, Rav Yosef explains the *Baraisa* as follows: The garments where "*bahd*" is written by it should be made of linen, new, of twisted thread, and of six-fold thread. Some of these provisions are non-essential requirements, while others are indispensable.

Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina says that "*bahd*" refers to linen, for it connotes that which comes up from the ground singly. It cannot be referring to wool, for wool splits. And although flax splits as well, it only splits through beating (*but not naturally*).

Ravina said, We know that "*bahd*" is linen from the following verse: *They shall have linen turbans upon their heads* (*and shall have linen pants upon their loins; they shall not gird themselves ba'yaza*). [*Since the Torah states that the pants should be made from "bahd," and this verse in Yechezkel says that it should be made from linen, it is evident that "bahd" refers to linen.*]

Rav Ashi asked Ravina: Then how was it known before Yechezkel came?

The *Gemara* retorts that Yechezkel similarly wrote a verse that prohibited a *Kohen* without a circumcision from serving. In both cases, the rule was known through an oral tradition, until Yechezkel came and codified it.

Abaye explains that when the verse states: *they shall not gird themselves ba'yaza* – that means that they should not gird themselves (*with the belt*) in a place where they sweat (*where flesh rubs against flesh*). This is as it was taught in the following *Baraisa*: When they gird themselves, they must not do so below their loins, nor above their elbows; rather, they shall gird themselves in a place corresponding to their elbows.

Rav Ashi said: Huna bar Nassan told me: I was once standing before King Izgedar; my girdle lay high up, whereupon he pulled it down, observing to me: It is written of you: [And you shall be to Me] a kingdom of Kohanim and a holy nation. When I came before Ameimar he said to me: The text: And kings shall be your nurturers has been fulfilled in you. (18b3– 19a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The Belt of the Kohanim and the Gartel

Many have the custom to don a *gartel* during prayer. The *kohanim* also put on a belt (*avneit*) during their service in the Temple. In this article we shall treat the unique function of the *avneit* and its implications for wearing a *gartel* on Shabos.

In our *sugya* Rav says that the *avneit* "cuts." In other words, if the *avneit* draws up the *kohen's* trousers so that they are too short, his service is disqualified.

HaGaon Rav Dov Ber Karasik zt"l (*Pischei 'Olam*, Ch. 21, *S.K.* 4), a Rabbi in Lithuania, learnt our *Gemara*according to its simple meaning, that the cloth under the *avneit* is considered cut. And if you ask that every *kohen* wore an *avneit* and his trousers were therefore cut, this *kohen* wore trousers that were too shortened by his *avneit* and therefore his service was disqualified.

Should *tzitzis* not be put through a belt? The above *gaon* even ruled that a person should not put his *tzitzis* through his belt as the belt "cuts" the *tzitzis* and they are regarded as cut off. The author of Responsa *Mishneh Halachos* (III, 40) wondered about this ruling as, if it is correct, a person must not wear a *gartel* on Shabos where there is no *eiruv.* The *gartel* "cuts" the lower portion of his coat, which is no longer part of the garment and should be forbidden to carry... (See what he explains, that the person does not want at all to shorten his garment but on the contrary, the *gartel* is an additional garment and does not

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

resemble our *sugya* at all, which deals with someone who wants to shorten his garment, and see ibid. for further explanation).

Daf HaYomi learners surely want to know the meaning of Rav's statement. In fact, Rav does not mean to say that the *avneit* **cuts** the garment beneath it. He means to say that if a *kohen's* trousers are too long, he may turn over the upper hem (waist) under the *avneit.* The *avneit* then shortens the trousers to fit the *kohen* and he is wearing a suitable garment (*Nishmas Adam, kelal 11, S.K.* 3; the *poskim* also discuss the question of wearing a *gartel* on Shabos where there is no *'eiruv*; see Responsa *Igros Moshe, O.C.*, III, 46; Responsa *Beer Moshe,* III, 64-66; *Beris 'Olam, Hamotzi,* 15-16; *Az Nidberu*, V, 23; *Minchas Yitzchak,* V, 41; *Orchos Rabeinu*, I, p. 135; *Shemiras Shabos Kehilchasah*, 18:5).

DAILY MASHAL

The Rare Beauty of the Garments of the Kohanim and their Unique Function

During their service in the Temple the *kohanim* had to wear special garments known as *bigdei kehunah.* Ramban (Shemos 28:2) mentions that these garments must be made for their own sake (*lisheman* – i.e., when they are made one should have in mind that they are made to be *bigdei kehunah*) just as the parchment for a *sefer Torah* should be made for its mitzvah (see *Minchas Chinuch*, mitzvah 99, paragraph 9, who writes that there is a difference of opinions in the Yerushalmi Yoma 3:6 concerning this matter and see ibid, who writes that according to Rambam there is no need to make them *lishemah*). Based on our *sugya*, Rambam rules (*Hilchos Kelei HaMikdash*, 8:4) that "*bigdei kehunah* should be new and fine like the clothes of the great, as we are told: "for honor and splendor."

Know whom you serve: The author of *Sefer HaChinuch* (mitzvah 99) examines the roots of the mitzvah of *bigdei kehunah* and explains that the "atoning representative" –i.e., the *kohen* – must devote all his abilities to the holy service. Therefore, he wore special garments so that every part of his body would remind him of his role and immediately he would remember before whom he serves. He compares *bigdei kehunah* to *tefillin* and says "and this is like *tefillin*, that everyone has been commanded to put on the end of one's body to remember to have fitting thoughts."

Sefer HaChinuch explains that this is the reason that the *kutones* extends to above the heel, so that the *kohen* should always feel it. The sleeve extends to the hand, also so that he should feel it. The cloth of the *mitznefes* (turban) was 16 *amos* long "so that he would see it every time he lifts his eyes" and the belt (*avnet*) was 32 *amos* long, so that his arms would always touch it because of its thickness and he would remember in fear where he is and what is his holy duty.

Ramban: *bigdei kehunah* were in practice in the era of the kings mentioned in the Torah: Ramban (Shemos 28:2) writes that *bigdei kehunah* were frequent in royal houses in the era of the kings mentioned in the Torah and he attests that the *mitznefes* is "known also today among kings and important ministers". The *bigdei kehunah* were so beautiful that HaGaon Rav Yitzchak Elchanan zt"l (*Beer Yitzchak, Y.D.* 32) asserted that a *kohen* must never wear them in the time of his mourning.

In his *Moreh Nevuchim* (III, 45), Rambam explains that the Torah commanded *kohanim* to wear fine clothes because "the masses do not respect a person in his true form but for the wholeness of his limbs and the beauty of his garments." In other words, outward splendor can influence hearts and cause that everyone should honor and aggrandize the Temple (all this pertains to the revealed aspect of the reasons for the mitzvah; see further in Ramban, ibid.)

The old suit: The author of *Torah Lishmah* emphasized an interesting aspect of the halachos of *bigdei kehunah* to a person who had two suits. One was new but not tailored according to local custom while the other was old but conservatively designed. The person appealed to Rabbi Yosef Chayim zt"l with the question as to which suit he should wear for Shabos. "You should wear the old suit," he instructed him, "as Rambam rules (*Hilchos Klei HaMikdash*, 8:4) that if a *kohen* dons garments that are too long or too short, his service is disqualified whereas if he wears old garments, his service is not disqualified."