

פרק שביעי – צוגין אלו Introduction to

In *פרק ו'*, we saw a list of *בהמה מומי* that justify *שחיטת בכור*; this chapter expands the list to include those *מומים* that render a *כנה* unfit for *עבודה* 31.7.1; 43a (משנה א) → 44a (דלא אישחור גרדומי)

1. עגרת או שבור או חרוץ או נקלת או גרב או ילפת לא תקריבו אלה לה' ואשה לא תתנו מהם על המזבח לה': ויקרא כב, כב
2. או גבן או דק או תבלל בעינו או גרב או ילפת או מרוח אשף: ויקרא כא, כ
3. כל איש אשר בו מום מנער אהרן הפהן לא יגש להקריב את אשי ה' מום בו את לחם אלהיו לא יגש להקריב: ויקרא כא, כא
4. אך אל הפרכת לא יבא ואל המזבח לא יגש כי מום בו ולא יחלל את מקדשי כי אני ה' מקדשם: ויקרא כא, כג
5. וקרכו בני אהרן הפהנים את הנתיחים את הראש ואת הפדר על העצים אשר על האש אשר על המזבח: ויקרא א, ח
6. כי כל איש אשר בו מום לא יקרב איש עזר או פסח או חורם או שרוץ: ויקרא כא, יח

- I 140 extension of מומים to כהנים; all מומים listed in פרק ו' apply to כהנים - even if temporary - plus...
- a head: ראשו שקוט, ראשו סקיפת
 - i זילון: head is shaped like a barrel-cover (wide below and tapering on top)
 - ii לפתן: head is shaped like a turnip (round and wide on top, tapering below)
 - iii מקבן: head shaped like a hammer
 - iv דאשו שקוט: head appears to have a piece missing in front
 - v דאשו סקיפת: head appears to have a piece missing in back (per aphorism)
 - 1 זרייתא: if his neck is שקוט (can't be seen) or שמוט (abnormally long neck)
 - b Back: a hump (hunchback) - מום חכמים consider a מום
 - i Note: only disagree if there is no bone (dissimilar; yet just "flesh"); if bone present - all agree it is a מום
 - c Hair: baldness is a מום
 - i Definition: if he doesn't have a hairline going from ear to ear
- II General analysis of relationship between מומי בהמה
- a Question1: why do all מומי בהמה apply to כנה - יבלת is only written in re: animal (v. 1)
 - b Question2: why did we list תבלול (v. 2) in last פרק - mentioned only in re: כהנים
 - i Answer (to both): v. 1&2 both invoke גרב and ילפת to establish גז"ש from מומי בהמה (v. 1) to כהנים (v. 2)
 - ii Observation: both words must be superfluous (מופנה); else, we could challenge גז"ש in each direction
 - iii מצוות בהמה, as he has lots of מצוות
 - 1 Response: indeed, it is superfluous
 - (a) Argument: no need to write גרב if ילפת, which isn't disgusting, is still a מום ק"ו - מום is a גרב that גרב is a מום
 - (b) Therefore: גרב (x2) is superfluous
 - (c) Question: why didn't the תורה write them all in one place and use גרב/ילפת: גרב/ילפת to connect them?
 - (i) Challenge: if it only wrote them in re: אדם, we would apply אדם to בהמה
 1. But: hooves and gums (which don't apply to אדם; his gums are covered by his teeth) - כשרים
 - (ii) And if: it only wrote them in re: בהמה, we would apply אדם to מומי בהמה
 1. But: גבן (on eyebrows) and חרום (squashed nose), which don't apply to בהמה - not אדם
 - c Question: why didn't תורה write common מומים in 1 place, גרב and ילפת in both, and unique ones where they belong?
 - i Answer (to entire line of questioning): per תדר"י - פרשה which is repeated is only done so for new info
 - d כנה and בכור, קדשים מומין for תורה to write זכא
 - i If: only legislated מומי כנה, wouldn't apply further - as he has many מצוות
 - ii And if: only legislated מומי קדשים, wouldn't apply to אדם, as the animal is offered on מזבח
 - iii And if: it only legislated מומי בכור, wouldn't apply to other קדשים, as בכור has born-קדושה
 - iv And if: it only legislated קדשים, we wouldn't apply to אדם, as קדשים themselves are offered
 - v And if: it only legislated קדשים, we wouldn't apply to בכור, as בכור has many types (unlike בכור)
 - vi Observation: we cannot infer any of them from just one; perhaps two would have been sufficient
 - 1 Proposal: let the תורה omit בכור and infer from ודאם קדשים
 - (a) Rejection: they have wider-range of קדושה and it applies to פשוטים (non-בכורות)
 - 2 Proposal: let the תורה omit קדשים and infer from ובכור אדם
 - (a) Rejection: אדם ובכור are both born into their status
 - 3 Proposal: let the תורה omit אדם and infer from וקדשים אדם
 - (a) Rejection: בכור וקדשים are both offered on מזבח
 - 4 Justifying: all 3 needing to be written

- III Further analysis of relationship between מומים which apply to animals and מומי כהן that are unique and general
- a Source: for "extra" מומים for כהנים – v. 3 – must look "normal"
 - b Question: what is consequential difference between מומים and "כל איש..."?
 - i Answer: if a כהן has a bona fide מום, his עבודה is profaned (& invalid – v. 4); if only "different-looking" – not מחולל
 - c And: difference between "שאינו שוה..." to a "מום" due to מראית העין?
 - i Answer: performing עבודה with a blemish only banned due to מראית העין (e.g. no eyelashes) – no איסור עשה at all
- IV Comments on פסול of baldness –
- a משנה: must have hairline extending from ear to ear
 - i רבא (version 1): only invalid if he has no hair in back but has hair in front
 - 1 But if: he has hair in back and front – כשר (and certainly if he has only in back)
 - ii רבא (version 2): comment on סיפא (if he has hairline, כשר) – only if he has hair in back
 - 1 But if: he has both – invalid (and certainly if he has only in front)
 - b שווה בזרעו של אהרן הכהן – פסול לעבודה – not כהן – זבלגנים (eyes always tearing) are bald, midgits or כהנים ד' יוחנן
 - i Note: only new information here is זבלגנים (קרחתים) – משנה ו – ננסים; משנה ג – משה
 - ii Teaching: that it isn't "just" מראית העין, but an essential disfigurement מן התורה
 - 1 Challenge: whenever there is a מראית העין cause, the תנא stipulates so – as in ג משנה in re: lost eyelashes
 - 2 Answer: so that we don't think that that one mention "carries over" to other
 - (a) Challenge: but each time a מראית העין concern is listed, the תנא explicates – as in ה' משנה in re: lost teeth
 - iii Rather: מראית העין [v. 5] (הכהנים) – includes קרחנים (ר' יהודה is in apposition to ר' יוחנן)
- V משנה א: meaning and application of גבן (v. 2)
- a ח"ק: if he has no eyebrows or only one
 - i Challenge: גבן cannot mean that he has none; מדרש הלכה reads גבן as having many; none – או גבן
 - 1 Answer (רבא): indeed; our מדרש is using גבן
 - b דוסא: if his eyebrows are so long they lie over his eyes
 - c דחב"א: if he has two backs and two spines (גב)
 - i Challenge: such a one is not viable, per רב's ruling – if human, mother has no טומאת יולדת; if animal – אסור באכילה
 - ii Answer: per רב's answer to שימי – ר' רחב"א is referring to a bent back that looks like two
- VI משנה ב: disfigurement of חרום (v. 6)
- a Definition: if his nose is so flat that he can color both eyes at once
 - b Other ocular invalidities (all due to מראית העין): if his eyes are high, low, one high the other low, if he can two stories at the same time, if he is סך שמש, אגון or צירן (explained below) or if his eyelashes fell out
 - i Note: "high" and "low" cannot mean that they look up or down – that is the same as "two stories"
 - 1 Therefore: must mean that they are placed there; even if in a row, if he looks up and sees down – פסול
 - 2 Support: ברייתא - בעינו (v. 2) anything in eye; even if he speaks with A and B claims he was looking at him
 - c בריתא: definition of חרום – his nose is flat; extend (via חרום) to very short and turned up, sealed up or long
 - i יוסי: חרום only applies to one who can color both eyes at once
 - ii חכמים: that's excessive; even if he cannot color them at once, still considered חרום
 - d עוור (v. 6) means blind, in one eye or in both eyes. White spots or chronic tearing – from איש עוור
 - i רבא: justification for בעינו, דק, תבלול, עור, איש, עור, דק, תבלול, בעינו
 - 1 If: we only had עור, would think that only because he has no vision; but חוורר would be valid
 - 2 And if: we only had איש עוור (→ חוורר והמים), because he cannot see, but a stain (דק) is valid
 - 3 And if: we only had דק, because his seeing is impaired, but not if there is a "confusion" in his eyes
 - 4 And if: we only had תבלול, because there is real confusion within the eyes
 - 5 Therefore: we need בעינו to invalidate even when it just has unusual appearance
 - (a) In conclusion: if he can't see – anchored in איש; if it is deficient – דק; if confused – תבלול; if unusual – בעינו
 - e Explanation of שמש, זגון צירן:
 - i סכי שמש: one who "hates the sun" (can't look at it)
 - ii ר' הונא: ר' הונא (who was insulted) as an example – each eye looks different
 - 1 Challenge: בריתא identifies זגדום (זגדן) as one black and one white
 - 2 Answer: the תנא refers to any unmatched pair of eyes as זגדום
 - iii צירן: if his eyes are very wide or always tearing
 - 1 בריתא: adds זדיר (strange eyes); לופין (too many bristles) and תמיר (no bristles)
 - (a) Challenge: if his eyelashes are gone, this is only a consideration of מראית העין
 - (b) Answer: if follicles remain, only מראית העין; if none – essential מום