

פרק שביעי – צוגין אלו Introduction to

In 31.7.1; 43a (משנה א) → 44a (דלא אישתיור גרומי) we saw a list of מומי בהמה that justify שחיטת בכור; this chapter expands the list to include those מומים that render a כהן unfit for עבודה

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 אשך: ויקרא כא, כ
3. כל איש אשר בו מום מזרע 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. ויכרכו בגי אהרן הפהנים את הפתחים 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 תרם או שרוץ: ויקרא כא, יח

- I 101 extension of מומים to כהנים; all מומים listed in פרק ו' apply to כהנים - even if temporary - plus...
- a **head:** ראשו שקוט, ראשו שקיפת
 - i **גילון:** 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 **ראשו שקוט:** head appears to have a piece missing in front
 - v **ראשו סקיפת:** head appears to have a piece missing in back (per aphorism)
 - 1 **ברייתא:** if his neck is שקוט (can't be seen) or שמוט (abnormally long neck)
 - b **Back:** a hump (hunchback) - יהודה ר' does not consider a 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 to מומי כהן
- a **Question1:** why do all מומי בהמה apply to כהן - יבלת is only written in re: animal (v. 1)
 - b **Question2:** why did we list דק 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 מומי כהנים (v. 2)
 - ii **Observation:** both words must be superfluous (מופנה); else, we could challenge גז"ש in each direction
 - iii **צוות בהמה:** cannot teach us אדם, as it is offered on מזבח; אדם cannot teach us 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 - 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 מומי 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 - any פרשה which is repeated is only done so for new info
 - d **כהן בכור, קדשים:** need for תורה to write מומין for מומין
 - i **If:** only legislated כהן מומי, 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 אדם 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 בכור אדם
 - (a) **Rejection:** אדם ובכור are both born into their status
 - 3 **Proposal:** let the תורה omit אדם and infer from אדם וקדשים
 - (a) **Rejection:** אדם ובכור are both offered on מזבח
 - 4 **Justifying:** all 3 needing to be written

- III Further analysis of relationship between מומים that are unique and general מומים which apply to animals
- 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 זבלגנים (eyes always tearing) are bald, midglets or זבלגנים (קרחנים) – in our משנה; ננסים; משנה ו in – ננסים
- i Note: only new information here is זבלגנים (קרחנים) – in our משנה
- 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 משנה ג 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 משנה ה' in re: lost teeth
- iii Rather: ר' יוחנן is in apposition to ר' יהודה – these three are "only" מראית העין [v. 5] - includes קרחנים
- V משנה א: meaning and application of גבן (v. 2)
- a ת"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; או גבן – none
- 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 יולדת – if animal – טומאת יולדת
- ii Answer: per רב's answer to ר' 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, א זגרון 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 ברייתא: 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: 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 חוורור would be valid
- 2 And if: we only had איש עוור (→ חוורור 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 זגרון צירן, שכי שמש, זגרון
- i שכי שמש: one who "hates the sun" (can't look at it)
- ii זגרון: ר' יהודה (who was insulted) as an example – each eye looks different
- 1 Challenge: ברייתא identifies זגרון (=זגרון) as one black and one white
- 2 Answer: the תנא refers to any unmatched pair of eyes as זגרון
- iii צירן: if his eyes are very wide or always tearing
- 1 ברייתא: 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