



Volume 11. Issue 24

One Eyebrow

The *Torah* outlines a number of blemishes that render a *Kohen* unfit for *avodah*. One of these is referred to in *Sefer Vayikrah* (21:20) as '*Giben*'. The *Mishnah* in the seventh *perek* of *Bechoros* provides further detail on these blemishes. The second *Mishna* discusses blemishes related to hair, namely those *kohanim* that were bald or did not have eyebrows, or even one eyebrow according to the *Tanna Kamma*, would be invalid. The *Tanna Kamma* states that this blemish is the definition of the term '*Giben*' mentioned in the *Torah*.

The *mefarshim* argue about the invalidation that the *Tanna Kamma* is referring to when referencing one eyebrow. The *Tifferet Yisrael* explains that the intention is one eyebrow that stretches across both eyes. The *Tifferet Yaakov* explains the blemish to mean a *kohen* who has one eyebrow missing. However the *Bach* explains that the term in the *Torah* which is '*Giben*' means one eye, and therefore the blemish specifically refers to one who has hair over one eye only. The *Hadrat Kodosh* cites that the simple meaning is the lack of hair over one eye, yet points out a *diyuk* in the *Rambam* to explain that this invalidation may be referring to a protrusion over one eye only, on which hair does not grow, giving the appearance of hair being missing over one eye.

The *Rashash* questions this simple interpretation. He mentions that if missing one eyebrow would be considered a blemish then it would be superfluous for the *Mishna* to then explain that missing two eyebrows would be considered a blemish. The *Rashash* answers that although it may seem that the blemish of missing two eyebrows can be learnt through a *kal v'chomer* argument, both categories need to be mentioned. There may be an argument made that if a *kohen* had only one eyebrow and therefore had a lopsided appearance this may be a more stringent blemish than a person that had both eyebrows missing. Additionally, this blemish needed to be classified on its own because one may have an argument to classify this blemish amongst a more general category of blemishes which apply when the body is not in balance – for example where one limb is larger than another (a blemish termed '*saruah*'). Therefore, this blemish needs to be mentioned in

order to classify it together with the blemish of having no eyebrows at all (defined under the term '*giben*').

The *Rambam* writes that someone who has no eyebrows at all is what is referred to in the *Torah* as '*Giben*' and adds that the blemish of having only one eyebrow is *pasul*¹. The *Chazon Ish* explains this to mean that someone who has only one eyebrow is not inherently blemished, but rather is invalidated due to the fact that he is 'not the same/equivalent to all other progeny of *Aharon*' which is an extrinsic invalidation. However, one that has no eyebrows at all is inherently blemished. Therefore, explains the *Chazon Ish*, one cannot be learnt from the onother via *kal v'chomer* as the sources of their invalidation are not equivalent.

The *Mishna* continues by offering the opinions of other *Tannaim* regarding the definition of the word '*Giben*' mentioned in the *Torah*. *Rabbi Dosa* explains the term to refer to one whose eyebrow hair has grown so long that it falls over his eyes. The *Tifferet Yisrael* explains that a *kohen* is invalidated only while this hair has not been cut. However, if a *kohen* was to trim this eyebrow hair, then the blemish would be removed and the *kohen* would be allowed to perform the *avodah*.

The *Mikdash Yechezkel* and *Yad Binyamin* seek to prove this *din* that one who trims or shaves his eyebrow hair is permitted to work in the *mikdash*. The *Gemara* in *Ketubot* (75a) writes that a *kohen* who has a foul odour is invalidated from undertaking the *avodah*. However, if this person were to wash and rinse his whole body, and/or make use of perfumes, then they would be allowed to do *avodah*. Therefore, prior to his performance of the *avodah* he has removed the blemish and his *avodah* is acceptable. The implication of this ruling is that the permissibility of a *Kohen* to do *avodah* depends on his state while he is undertaking that activity. This case is analogous to one who has long eyebrow hair. If he rids himself of this blemish prior to performing the *avodah* then the impediment no longer exists to invalidate him. Therefore at the time he performs *avodah* he is no longer classified as a blemished *Kohen* and his *avodah* is acceptable.

Yehuda Gottlieb

¹ The *Chazon Ish* points out that this statement would indeed seem to contradict the *Mishna's* explanation that both one who has both or even one eyebrow missing would fall under the definition of '*Giben*' in the *Torah*.

Revision Questions

בכורות ו: י"ח ח"ד

- Name three things that are blemishes and need not be measured? (ו: י)
- To which part of the animal's body must the tail reach to not be considered a blemish? (ו: י"א)
- Name three blemishes that are not permanent and when found in an animal do not permit its slaughter? (ו: י"ב)
- Explain the following blemishes in human beings
 - Kilon*
 - Laftan*
 - Makavan*
 - Shakua*
 - Shekifas*? (ז: א)
- How does the *Mishnah* define someone who is termed 'bald'? (ז: ב)
- What is a *harum*? (ז: ג)
- If one's eyelashes have fallen out is this considered a blemish? (ז: ג)
- How big or small are one's eyes if they are considered a *mum*? (ז: ד)
- What is a *tzimeah*? (ז: ד)
- What is a *tzimem*? (ז: ד)
- What are some problems with one's lips that would be defined as a *mum*? (ז: ה)
- What are the three definitions given for *mro'ach ashech*? (ז: ה)
- What is an *ikel*? (ז: ו)
- What is a *pika*? (ז: ו)
- When is an additional finger considered a *mum*? (ז: ז)
- Which case of additional fingers is subject to debate? (ז: ז)
- Explain the debate regarding one who is ambidextrous. (ז: ז)
- What nine *mumim* listed are not considered *mumim* for animals? (ז: ח)
- What five blemishes are considered *mumim* for animals but not for humans? (ז: ח)
- Till when is a *kohen* that married a divorcee invalid for service in the *Beit Ha'Mikdash*? (ז: ח)
- Provide the cases for the following situations – a person is considered:
 - A *bechor* for inheritance, but not for the *kohen* (i.e. does not require *pidyon bechor*)?
 - A *bechor* for the *kohen* but not for inheritance? (ז: ט)
- Explain the debate regarding the case where the first son was born via caesarean section and the second son was born naturally? (ז: ט)
- What is the law regarding a case where a person gave birth to twin boys and but we are not sure which was born first? (ז: ט)
- Regarding the previous question what is the law if one of the children passed away prior to *pidyon bechor*? What is the law if the father passed away? (Provide both opinions.) (ז: ט)
- What other two cases are similar to the ones in the previous question? (ז: ט)

Local Shiurim

Melbourne, Australia

Sunday -Thursday
10 minutes before *Mincha*
Mizrachi Shul
Melbourne, Australia

Friday & Shabbat
10 minutes before *Mincha*
Beit Ha'Roeh
Melbourne, Australia

Efrat, Israel *Shiur in English*

Sunday -Thursday
Rabbi Mordechai Scharf
9:00am
Kollel Magen Avraham
Reemon Neighbourhood

ONLINE SHIURIM

Rabbi Chaim Brown
www.shemayisrael.com/mishna/

Rav Meir Pogrow
613.org/mishnah.html

Rabbi E. Kornfeld
Rabbi C. Brown
<http://www.dafyomi.co.il/calendars/myomi/myomi-thisweek.htm>

SHIUR ON KOL HALOSHON

Rabbi Moshe Meir Weiss
In US dial: 718 906 6400
Then select: 1 – 2 – 4

Next Week's Mishnayot...

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	שבת קודש
6 th July ח' תמוז	7 th July ט' תמוז	8 th July י' תמוז	9 th July יא' תמוז	10 th July יב' תמוז	11 th July יג' תמוז	12 th July יד' תמוז
Bechorot 8:5-6	Bechorot 8:7-8	Bechorot 8:9-10	Bechorot 9:1-2	Bechorot 9:3-4	Bechorot 9:5-6	Bechorot 9:7-8

