

דף יומי • בכורות • דף מ"ג

Daf Yomi • The Full Daf • Elucidated Talmud • Navy & Gold Edition • with Rashi

THE SUGYA

We are starting the seventh perek of Maseches Bekhorot, "On These Blemishes." After spending the previous perek learning about the various blemishes that disqualify an animal from being offered on the Mizbe'ach, the Mishnah now transitions to the halachos of Kohanim. The Tanna teaches us that any blemish that disqualifies an animal, whether permanent or temporary, also disqualifies a Kohen from performing the Avodah in the Beis HaMikdash.

In addition to those shared blemishes, the Mishnah introduces a list of unique physical deformities that apply davka to Kohanim. These include various abnormal head shapes, such as a head shaped like a turnip or a hammer, as well as the status of a bald Kohen. The Gemara immediately steps in to analyze the source for this comparison between animal blemishes and human blemishes, launching into a beautiful lomdishe discussion of how we derive these halachos from one another.

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

עמוד א' DAF 43A

ANSWER

לפסול במקום אחים, ולחלוץ שלא במקום אחים, איכא בינייהו.

The practical difference **between them is** with regard to **disqualifying** the widow from yibum **where there are** other **brothers**, **and** also with regard to whether he must **perform chalitza** **where there are no** other **brothers**.

STATEMENT

הדרן עלך על אלו מומין.

May we return to you, "On These Blemishes" (the seventh perek of Bekhorot).

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' מומין אלו, בין קבועין בין עוברים — פוסלין באדם,

MISHNAH: **These blemishes** that we learned in the previous perek regarding animals, **whether** they are **permanent or** whether they are **transient, disqualify in a person**—meaning, they disqualify a Kohen from performing the Avodah in the Beis HaMikdash.

MISHNAH

ויתר עליהן: הפילון, והלפתן, והמקבן, ושראשו שקוט, וסקיפת.

And in addition to them, there are other blemishes that apply only to a person: **one whose head is pointed** like a cone; and **one whose head is turnip-like**, being wide on top and narrow below; and **one whose head is hammer-like**, with his forehead

protruding; and one whose head is flat in the back; and one whose head is protruding in the back.

MISHNAH

ובעלי חטרות — רבי יהודה מכשיר, וחכמים פוסלין.

And regarding those with humped backs, Rabbi Yehuda deems them fit for service, and the Sages disqualify them.

MISHNAH

הקרח פסול. איזהו קרח? כל שאין לו שיטה של שער מוקפת מאוזן לאוזן, אם יש לו — הרי זה כשר.

A bald person is disqualified from the Avodah. Who is considered a bald person? Anyone who does not have a row of hair encircling his head from ear to ear; but if he has such a row of hair, he is fit for service.

גְמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

גמ' אמאי? והאיכא יבולת, דלא כתיב באורייתא באדם!

GEMARA: The Gemara asks: Why does the Mishnah say that all the blemishes of an animal apply to a person? But isn't there the blemish of a wart, which is not written in the Torah regarding a person, but only regarding an animal?

QUESTION

ותו: דק תבולול, דלא כתיבי בבמה!

And furthermore, there are the blemishes of a cataract and a mixture in the eye, which are not written regarding an animal, but only regarding a person!

ANSWER

מילף ילפי מהדדי, דתנאי: באדם לא נאמר בו יבולת, בבמה לא נאמר דק תבולול,

The Gemara answers: They are derived from one another, as it is taught in a Braisa: Regarding a person, "wart" is not mentioned; regarding an animal, "cataract" and "mixture" are not mentioned.

PROOF

מנין ליתן את האמור של זה בזה ואת האמור של זה בזה? תלמוד לומר: "גרב" "גרב", "יִלְפֹת" "יִלְפֹת" לגזירה שוה.

From where do we know to apply that which is said of this case to that one, and that which is said of this case to that one? The Torah says "scab" and "scab", "scurvy" and "scurvy" in both places, for a gezerah shavah.

EXPLANATION

מפני, דאי לא מפני, איכא למיפרה:

The Gemara notes: These words must be free for the gezerah shavah, for if they are not free, there is a refutation that can be made to break the comparison:

EXPLANATION

אדם מבהמה לא יליר, שכן היא עצמה קריבה לגבי מזבח;

We could argue that a person cannot be derived from an animal, because the animal itself is offered upon the Altar, making its blemishes more critical;

EXPLANATION

בהמה מאדם לא ילפא, שכן נתרבה במצות.

and an animal cannot be derived from a person, because a person is included in performing mitzvos, making him more sanctified.

STATEMENT

לאיי, אפנויי מפני,

Indeed, they are free for the gezerah shavah.

PROOF

לכתוב רחמנא "ילפת" ולא פעי "גרב", ואנא אמינא: ומה ילפת דלא מאיסא הוי מומא, גרב דמאס לא כל שפון?

The Gemara proves this: Let the Merciful One write "scurvy" and there would be no need for "scab", and I would say on my own: If scurvy, which is not so repulsive, is a blemish, then a scab, which is repulsive, is it not all the more so a blemish?

PROOF

"גרב" "גרב" דכתב רחמנא למה לי? לאפנויי.

If so, why do I need "scab" and "scab" which the Merciful One wrote? It must be to make them free for the gezerah shavah.

QUESTION

ולכתבינהו רחמנא כולהו בחד, וגרב וילפת הקא והכא, ולילפו מחדא!

The Gemara asks: But let the Merciful One write all of them in one place, either by animals or by Kohanim, and write "scab" and "scurvy" here and here, and let them learn all the other blemishes from that one place through the gezerah shavah!

ANSWER

אהיאי ביהי ליכתב רחמנא?

The Gemara answers: On which one should the Merciful One write them?

EXPLANATION

אי כתב באדם, הוה אמינא: כל דפסול באדם פסול בבהמה, קלוט וחוטין דליתנהו באדם, בבהמה נמי לא ליפסלו.

If He had written them by a person, I would say: Only that which is disqualified in a person is disqualified in an animal; but closed hooves and damaged gums, which do not apply to a person, should also not disqualify in an animal.

EXPLANATION

וּלְכָתוּב רַחֲמֵנָא פּוֹלְחוֹ בְּבֵהֶמָה, הִנֵּה אֲמִינָא: כָּל דְּפָסוּל בְּבֵהֶמָה פָּסוּל בְּאָדָם, גַּבְזָא וְחֵרוּם דְּלִיתְנָהוּ בְּבֵהֶמָה — בְּאָדָם נָמִי לֹא לִיפְסָלוּ.

And if the Merciful One had written all of them by an animal, I would say: Only that which is disqualified in an animal is disqualified in a person; but heavy eyebrows and a sunken nose, which do not apply to an animal, should also not disqualify in a person.

QUESTION

וּלְכַתְּבִינָהוּ רַחֲמֵנָא פּוֹלְחוֹ בְּחַד, וְהִנֵּה דְלִיתְנָהוּ בְּאִידָהּ — לְכָתוּב רַחֲמֵנָא בְּבֵהֶמָה, וְהִנֵּה דְלִיתְנָהוּ בְּאִידָהּ — לְכָתוּב בְּאָדָם, וְגַרְב וִילְפָת — הֵכָא וְהֵכָא, וְלִילְפוּ מִהֲדָדִי.

The Gemara asks: But let the Merciful One write all of the common blemishes in one place, and those that do not apply to the other, let the Merciful One write by animals, and those that do not apply to the other, let Him write by a person, and write "scab" and "scurvy" here and here, and let them learn from one another! Why write the common ones twice?

ANSWER

אֵלָּא, כְּתָנָא דְבֵי רַבִּי יִשְׁמָעֵאל, דְּתָנָא דְבֵי רַבִּי יִשְׁמָעֵאל: כָּל פְּרָשָׁה שְׁנָאֲמָרָה וְנִשְׁנִית — לֹא נִשְׁנִית אֵלָּא בְּשִׁבְלִי דְּכָר שְׁנַתְחַדֵּשׁ בָּהּ.

Rather, we must answer like the Tanna of the school of Rabbi Yishmael, for the Tanna of the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: Any parshah that was stated and repeated, was repeated only for the sake of the new detail that was introduced in it. Since some details had to be written in both places, the Torah repeated the entire topic.

QUESTION

אָמַר רַבָּא: לָמָּה לִי דְכָתַב רַחֲמֵנָא מוֹם בְּאָדָם, מוֹם בְּקֹדֶשִׁים, מוֹם בְּכֹרֹר?

Rava said: Why do I need the Merciful One to write the disqualification of a blemish by a person, a blemish by kodashim, and a blemish by a firstborn?

ANSWER

צָרִיקָא, דָּאִי כָתַב רַחֲמֵנָא מוֹם בְּאָדָם, שְׁכֵן נִתְרַפָּה בְּמִצְוֹת.

Rava answers: They are all necessary, for if the Merciful One had written the law of a blemish only by a person, I would say that is because he is included in performing many mitzvos, so he must be perfect;

EXPLANATION

אָדָם מְכֹרֵר בְּהֵמָה לֹא אֶתִּי, שְׁכֵן הוּא עֲצֻמוֹ קָרֵב לְגַבִּי מִזֶּבֶחַ.

and a person cannot be derived from a firstborn animal, because the firstborn itself is offered upon the Altar.

EXPLANATION

קֹדֶשִׁים מְכֹרֵר לֹא אֶתִּי, שְׁכֵן קְדוּשָׁתוֹ מִרְחֵם.

And kodashim cannot be derived from a firstborn, because a firstborn's sanctity is from the womb, making it unique.

EXPLANATION

אדם מקדשים לא אתי, שכן הו עצמו קריבין.

And a person cannot be derived from kodashim, because they themselves are offered on the Altar.

EXPLANATION

בכור מקדשים לא אתי, שכן קדושתו מרובה.

And a firstborn cannot be derived from kodashim, because the sanctity of kodashim is greater, as they can be holy as most holy sacrifices.

QUESTION

חדא מחדא לא אתיא, תיתי חדא מתרתיה?

So one cannot be derived from another. But let one be derived from two of the others!

QUESTION

מהי תיתי?! לא לכתב רחמנא בבכור, ותיתי מהנה?

The Gemara asks: From which ones should it be derived? Let the Merciful One not write it by a firstborn, and let it be derived from these two, Kohanim and kodashim?

EXPLANATION

מה להנה שכן קדושתו מרובה, ונוהגין בפשוטין.

We can refute this: What is unique about those two is that their sanctity is greater, and they apply to plain animals or non-firstborn Kohanim, whereas a firstborn is limited.

QUESTION

בקדשים, ותיתי מהנה?

Should He not write it by kodashim, and let it be derived from these two, Kohanim and firstborns?

EXPLANATION

מה להנה שכן קדושתו מאליהו!

We can refute this: What is unique about those two is that their sanctity comes on its own from birth or lineage, unlike kodashim which must be consecrated.

QUESTION

באדם, ותיתי מהנה?

Should He not write it by a person, and let it be derived from these two, kodashim and firstborns?

EXPLANATION

מה להנה שכן הו עצמו קריבין לגבי מזבח!

We can refute this: What is unique about those two is that they themselves are offered upon the Altar!

STATEMENT

Therefore, they are all **necessary**.

QUESTION

יתר עליהן באדם. מנא הני מילי?

The Mishnah taught: **In addition to them, by a person** there are other blemishes. The Gemara asks: **From where do we know these things?**

ANSWER

אמר רבי יוחנן, דאמר קרא: "כל איש אשר בו מום מזהר אהרן", איש ששׁוה בזרעו של אהרן.

Rabbi Yochanan said: As the verse says, "Any man of the seed of Aaron who has a blemish," which implies he must be a man who is **equal** in appearance to the rest of the **seed of Aaron**, excluding anyone with an abnormal head shape.

עמוד ב' DAF 43B

QUESTION

מאי איכא בין מומא לשאינו שׁוה בזרעו של אהרן?

The Gemara asks: **What difference is there between** a priest disqualified due to a full-fledged **blemish** and one disqualified because **he is not equal** among the seed of Aaron?

ANSWER

איכא משום אחולי עבודה:

The Gemara answers: **There is** a difference **with regard to profaning the** Temple service:

PROOF

מומא מחיל עבודה, דכתיב: "מום בו ולא יחלל",

a priest with a full-fledged **blemish** **profanes the service** he performs, as it is written: "He has a blemish; that he not **profane** My Sanctuaries,"

STATEMENT

שאינו שׁוה בזרעו של אהרן לא מחיל עבודה.

whereas a priest **who is not equal** among the seed of Aaron does not **profane the service** he performs.

QUESTION

מאי איכא בין שאינו שׁוה בזרעו של אהרן, ומשום מראית העין?

The Gemara asks further: **What difference is there between** one disqualified because **he is not equal** among the seed of **Aaron**, and one disqualified merely **due to the appearance** of a blemish?

ANSWER

איכא בינניהו עשה.

The Gemara answers: **There is** a difference **between them** regarding the violation of a positive commandment, an **aseh**. Serving while not equal among the seed of Aaron violates the positive command that Aaron's descendants must be normal, whereas serving with the appearance of a blemish is only a Rabbinic prohibition.

EXPLANATION

כִּילּוֹן — דְּדָמִי רִישִׁיה לְאַכְלָא,

The Gemara clarifies the blemishes listed in the Mishnah: A **kilon** is one **whose head resembles a barrel-cover**, which is narrow above and wide below.

EXPLANATION

”לַפְתָּא” — דְּדָמִי רִישִׁיה לְגִדְגָּלִידָא דְּלִיפְתָּא,

One whose head is turnip-like, a **lafta**, is one **whose head resembles the top of a turnip**, which is wide above and narrow below.

BRAISA

תָּנָא: וְצִוְּאָרוּ עוֹמֵד בְּאַמְצַע רָאָשׁוֹ.

A Tanna **taught** in a Braisa: **And his neck stands in the middle of his head**, meaning his head protrudes equally in all directions around his neck.

EXPLANATION

מַקְבָּן — דְּדָמִי רִישִׁיה לְמַקְבָּן,

A hammer-headed person, a **makkavan**, is one **whose head resembles a hammer**, with his forehead protruding.

EXPLANATION

”וְיִשְׂרָאֵשׁוּ שְׁקוּט” — מְלַפְנֵיו,

“**And one whose head is indented**,” a **shakut**, means he has a depression **from the front** of his head.

EXPLANATION

”וּסְקִיפָת” — מֵאַחֲרָיו, כְּדָאמְרֵי אִינְשֵׁי: שְׁקִיל פִּיפָא.

“**And a sekifat**” is one whose head is indented **from behind**, as people say: **A piece has been taken out** of his head.

BRAISA

תָּנָא: וְצִוְּאָרוּ שְׁקוּט וְשָׁמוּט.

A Tanna **taught** in a Braisa: **And a priest whose neck is shakut or shamut** is also disqualified.

EXPLANATION

”שְׁקוּט” — דְּחֻבִּיס מְחֻבָּס,

The Braisa explains: **Shakut** means a short neck **that is pressed in** and hidden between his shoulders.

EXPLANATION

”שָׁמוּט” — דְּאָרִיךְ וְשָׁמִיט.

Shamut means a neck that is long and thin.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

ובעלי חטורות רבי יהודה כו'.

We learned in the Mishnah: **And with regard to those with humped backs, Rabbi Yehuda** deems them fit for service, and the Rabbis deem them disqualified.

גמרא GEMARA

STATEMENT

דאית ביה עצם, כולי עלמא לא פליגי דפסולא.

The Gemara clarifies: In a case **where there is a bone in the hump, everyone agrees that it disqualifies** him from service.

STATEMENT

כי פליגי — דלית ביה עצם:

Where they disagree is in a case **where there is no bone** in the hump:

EXPLANATION

מר סבר — הא אינו שוה בזרעו של אהרן.

One **Master**, the Rabbis, **holds** that **this person is not equal among the seed of Aaron** and is therefore disqualified;

EXPLANATION

מר סבר — קרקורא דבישרא בעלמא הוא.

and one Master, Rabbi Yehuda, **holds** that **it is merely a gathering of flesh** and is not considered a blemish.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

הקרת פסול.

The Mishnah states: **A bald priest is disqualified.**

גמרא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אמר רבא: לא שנו אלא שאין לו לאחוריו ויש לו לפניו,

Rava said: They only taught that he is disqualified when he does not have a row of hair in the back of his head but he has a row of hair in the front;

STATEMENT

אבל יש לו לאחוריו — כשר,

but if he has a row of hair in the back, he is fit,

INFERENCE

וכל שפן שיש לו לאחוריו ואין לו לפניו.

and all the more so when he has hair in the back and does not have hair in the front, as this is typical of older men.

STATEMENT

ואיכא דמתני אסיפא, ואם יש לו — הרי זה כשר.

And there are those who teach this statement of Rava on the latter clause of the Mishnah: "And if he has a row of hair encircling his head, he is fit."

STATEMENT

אמר רבא: לא שנו אלא שיש לו לאחוריו ואין לו לפניו,

On this, Rava said: They only taught that he is fit when he has a row of hair in the back and does not have hair in the front;

STATEMENT

אבל יש לו בין לאחוריו בין לפניו — פסול,

but if he has a row of hair both in the back and in the front, he is disqualified,

INFERENCE

וכל שפן שיש לו לפניו ואין לו לאחוריו, ודאין לו כלל — דפסול.

and all the more so one who has hair in the front and does not have hair in the back, or one who has no hair at all, is disqualified.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי יוחנן: הקרחנין והננסין והזבֿלגנין — פסולין, לפי שאינן שוה בזרעו של אהרן.

Rabbi Yochanan said: Bald priests, and dwarf priests, and priests with leaky eyes are disqualified, because they are not equal among the seed of Aaron.

QUESTION

קרחנין — תנינא! ננסין — תנינא!

The Gemara asks: As for bald priests, we already learned this in our Mishnah! As for dwarfs, we already learned this in a later Mishnah!

ANSWER

זבֿלגנֿין איצטריך ליה לאַשמועֿינן, ומהו דתימא משום מראית העין.

The Gemara answers: **It was necessary for him to teach us** about those with **leaky eyes**, as this is not in the Mishnah, **lest you say** they are disqualified only **due to the appearance of a blemish**. He teaches that they are disqualified by Torah law.

QUESTION

והא כל היכא דאיכא משום מראית העין (איתנא) [מיתנא] קתני, ושנשו ריסי עיניו פסול מפני מראית העין!

The Gemara asks: **But anywhere that there is a disqualification due to the appearance of a blemish**, the Tanna explicitly **teaches it**, as we see in our Mishnah: "**And one whose eyelashes fell out is disqualified due to the appearance of a blemish**"! Why would we think leaky eyes is merely due to appearance if the Mishnah didn't say so?

ANSWER

מהו דתימא: תני חדא, והוא הדין לכולהו.

The Gemara answers: **Lest you say** that the Tanna **taught one** case of appearance of a blemish, **and the same law applies to all** the subsequent cases listed in the Mishnah.

OBJECTION

והא כל היכא דאיכא מיהדר ומיתנא, קא הדר ותני: ושניטלו שיניו פסול משום מראית העין!

The Gemara objects: **But anywhere that there is such a disqualification**, the Tanna **goes back and teaches it explicitly**, as he **goes back and teaches** later: "**And one whose teeth fell out is disqualified due to the appearance of a blemish**"! Thus, the Tanna does not rely on one general mention.

RESOLUTION

אָלאַ, לאַפּוקי מהא דתנא, דתנא: הקרחניו והננסין והזבֿלגנֿין פְּשָׁרִים, וְלֹא אָמְרוּ פְּסוּל אֶלָּא משום מראית העין.

Rather, Rabbi Yochanan's statement was to **exclude that which is taught in a Braisa**, as it is taught in a Braisa: **Bald priests, dwarfs, and those with leaky eyes are fit by Torah law, and they only said they are disqualified due to the appearance of a blemish**. Rabbi Yochanan teaches that they are actually disqualified by Torah law.

EXPLANATION

מאן האי תנא? רבי יהודה היא, דתנא: רבי יהודה אומר: "הכהנים" — לרבות הקרחניו.

The Gemara asks: **Who is this Tanna** of the Braisa who holds they are fit by Torah law? **It is Rabbi Yehuda**, as it is taught in a Braisa: **Rabbi Yehuda says**: The verse says "**the priests**" to include **bald priests** as fit for service.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתניי אין לו גביניו, או אין לו אלא גבין אחד — זהו גבן האמור בתורה.

MISHNAH: **One who has no eyebrows, or who has only one eyebrow**, this is the giben mentioned in the Torah as disqualified.

MISHNAH

רבי דוסא אומר: (שגבנין) [שגבנין] שוכבין.

Rabbi Dosa says: A giben is one whose eyebrows lie down because they are so long.

MISHNAH

רבי חנינא בן אנטיגנוס אומר: שיש לו שני גבין ושתי שדראות.

Rabbi Chanina ben Antigonus says: It is one who has two backs and two spinal columns.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

גמ' וגבן — דאין לו משמע?

GEMARA: And does giben imply that he has no eyebrows?

OBJECTION

ורמינהו: "גבן" — שיש לו גבנין הרבה, אין לו גבנין, או אין לו אלא גבין אחד — מנין? תלמוד לומר: "או גבן".

And they raised a contradiction from a Braisa: Giben literally means one who has many eyebrows. If so, one who has no eyebrows, or who has only one eyebrow, from where do we know he is disqualified? The verse teaches: "Or a giben." This contradicts our Mishnah which says giben itself means having no eyebrows!

RESOLUTION

אמר רבא: זהו מדרש "או גבן".

Rava said: Our Mishnah is stating that this is the exposition of "or a giben," which includes one with no eyebrows under the category of giben.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

רבי דוסא אומר כו'.

We learned in the Mishnah: Rabbi Dosa says etc. that a giben is one who has two backs and two spinal columns.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

למימרא דחיי?

The Gemara asks: Is this to say that such a creature can live?

OBJECTION

וְהָאֵיתָמַר: הַמְּפֹלֶת בְּרִיָּה שִׁישׁ לָהּ שְׁנֵי גִבִּין וּשְׁתֵּי שִׁדְרָאוֹת, וְאָמַר רַב: בְּאִשָּׁה — אֵינּוּ נוֹלָד, בְּבִהְמָה — אָסוּר בְּאֲכִילָה!

But was it not stated: One who discharges a creature that has two backs and two spinal columns, and Rav said: In a woman, it is not considered a viable offspring, and in an animal, it is forbidden to be eaten because it is a treifah that cannot live! How then could such a person grow up to be a priest?

STATEMENT

בָּבֶר רַמָּא נִיָּה לִיה רַב שִׁימִי בַר חִיָּיא לְרַב, וְאָמַר לִיה: שִׁימִי אַתָּה!

The Gemara answers: Rav Shimi bar Chiyya already raised this contradiction to Rav, and Rav said to him: Are you Shimi? You are indeed sharp!

RESOLUTION

אֲלֹא בִשְׁשִׁדְרָתוֹ עָקוּמָה.

Rather, Rabbi Chanina ben Antigonus refers to one whose spine is curved so that it looks like two spines, but he does not actually have two spinal columns.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְנַיִי הַחֲרוּם פָּסוּל. אֵיזֶהוּ חֲרוּם? הַכּוֹחַ לְשִׁתִּי עֵינָיו כְּאַחַת.

MISHNAH: A charum is disqualified. Who is a charum? One who can paint both of his eyes with blue eyeshadow at once because the bridge of his nose is so flat.

MISHNAH

שְׁתֵּי עֵינָיו לְמַעַלָּה, וּשְׁתֵּי עֵינָיו לְמַטָּה, עֵינּוֹ אַחַת לְמַעַלָּה וְעֵינּוֹ אַחַת לְמַטָּה,

One whose two eyes are above their proper place, or whose two eyes are below, or whose one eye is above and one eye is below,

MISHNAH

רוֹאֶה אֶת הַחֹדֶר וְאֶת הָעֶלְיָה כְּאַחַד, סָכִי שֶׁמֶשׁ, וְהֶגְדָּן, וְהַצִּירָן, וְשֶׁנֶּשְׂרוּ רִיסֵי עֵינָיו — פָּסוּל מִפְּנֵי מְרֵאִית הָעֵין.

or one who sees the room and the attic at once, or one who is sensitive to the sun, or one whose eyes are mismatched, zagdan, or one whose eyes run with water, tzeiran, or one whose eyelashes fell out — is disqualified due to the appearance of a blemish.

BRAISA

גמ' תנו רבנן: "חרום" — שחוטמו שקוע,

GEMARA: The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: "A charum" is one whose nose is sunken in.

BRAISA

חוטמו סולד, חוטמו בולם, חוטמו נוטף, מניין? תלמוד לומר: "או חרום".

If his nose turns upward, or his nose is turned inward, or his nose drips, from where do we know he is disqualified? The verse teaches: "Or a charum."

BRAISA

רבי יוסי אומר: אין "חרום" אלא הכוהיל שתי עיניו פאחת.

Rabbi Yose says: A charum is only one who can paint both of his eyes at once.

OBJECTION

אמרו לו: הפלגת.

The Sages said to him: You have gone too far with this extreme definition,

SUMMARY

The Gemara explains that although certain blemishes like warts are only written in the Torah by animals, and others like cataracts are only written by Kohanim, we learn them from each other through a gezerah shavah of the words "scab" and "scurvy." The Gemara goes through a classic shakla v'tarya to prove that these words are indeed free for the gezerah shavah, showing that we could not have derived them otherwise due to the unique stringencies of both Kohanim and animals. Finally, Rava brings a beautiful chiddush explaining why the Torah had to explicitly write the laws of blemishes by Kohanim, kodashim, and firstborn animals, demonstrating that we could not have derived any one of these categories from the other two.

The Gemara is bothered by a basic question: why does the Torah need to write the laws of blemishes three separate times, by a Kohen, by a firstborn animal, and by sacrificial animals? Rava answers that we could never learn one from the other. If the Torah only wrote it by a Kohen, we would think only he needs to be perfect because he is commanded in so many mitzvos. If only by a sacrifice, we would think only it needs to be perfect because it is offered directly on the Mizbe'ach. Each has its own unique path of holiness, so each needs its own explicit requirement for wholeness.

Look at the deep yesod the Gemara is teaching us here. We might look at another Yid who seems to have a completely different avodah than ours, maybe he is a massive masmid who learns all day, maybe he is a baal chessed running around for others, or maybe he is a working Yid struggling with emunah in the marketplace. The yetzer hara tries to make us compare ourselves, or worse, think that because we aren't on "their" level or doing "their" specific avodah, our own service of Hashem doesn't need to be complete. We think, "I'm not a big Rosh Yeshiva, so why do I need to be so careful with my speech?" or "I'm not a Kohen Gadol, so my small mitzvos don't need to be beautiful."

But the Torah is mechadesh that every single path of kedushah requires its own wholeness. Hashem wants **your** specific avodah to be complete, without blemishes. You cannot learn your requirements from anyone else. Your daily learning, your davening, your honesty in business, this is your Mizbe'ach, and Hashem wants it offered with a complete heart, beautiful and whole, exactly where you are.

Today, pick one small area of your personal avodah, whether it is saying a berachah slowly from a siddur, or learning for ten minutes without looking at your phone, and do it with absolute wholeness, making it a perfect offering to Hashem.