



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **MISHNAH (cont.):** The Mishnah continues to discuss issues that could potentially disqualify a korban during the receiving stage or the throwing of the blood stage.

### 2) Disqualified persons slaughtering a korban

The implication of the Mishnah that disqualified persons may slaughter a korban only בדיעבד is challenged from a Baraisa.

The Gemara reconciles the wording of the Mishnah to match the Baraisa.

This resolution is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Gemara discusses why semicha must be performed by a tahor person but slaughtering does not have to be performed by a tahor person.

R' Chisda presents an alternative version of this discussion according to which both semicha and slaughtering require a tahor person.

### 3) Partial entry

Ulla in the name of Reish Lakish teaches that a tamei person who reaches his hand into the azarah is liable to lashes.

R' Hoshaya unsuccessfully challenges this ruling.

In the midst of this discussion R' Yochanan teaches that there is not even a positive command that prohibits a tevul yom from entering the azarah.

R' Yosef draws an inference from Ulla's position that halacha can suspend the restriction against a zav from bringing a korban if the prohibition against tum'ah was also suspended.

Abaye challenges this inference and the exchange between them is recorded.

Rava defends R' Yosef against Abaye's challenge. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the status of a korban whose blood was applied to the wrong location?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
2. How do we know that it is not necessary for a kohen to slaughter a korban?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
3. What is the source that partial entry is considered entry?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
4. What is the point of dispute between R' Yosef and Abaye?  
 \_\_\_\_\_

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *Improper placement of the blood*

תנו על גבי הכבש שלא כנגד היסוד

The Mishnah lists a case where someone who was disqualified to apply the blood of the offering took the blood, and he placed it upon the Altar on a spot where it should not have been placed. The halacha is that if he placed the blood on the ramp, or to a part of the Altar which was not above the base, the offering is not invalid. Rather, if there is still some blood left in the animal's neck, someone who is eligible to collect it should return and collect some more blood and apply it properly.

Earlier (26a), Rashi explained that the Mishnah is illustrating two distinct examples of places on the Altar where the blood should not be placed. One is anywhere on the ramp, and the other is on the body of the Altar itself, but not above its base. The Altar had a base which protruded beyond its walls, but it did not circle the entire Altar. The base ran along the entire northern and western sides of the Altar, but it only extended beyond the northeast and southwest corners for the length of one cubit. The blood of an offering must be placed on the Altar itself, and must be done above where there was a base. Rambam (Hilchos Ma'asei HaKorbanos 5:7) adds that the blood must be placed near a corner, not more than one cubit away from it. Effectively, the blood can be applied to any of the corners except for the southeast corner.

Tiferes Yisroel (to Mishnah 2:1) explains that although the blood is supposed to be placed on the altar in several splashes (four for chattas, two for other offerings), if the blood was placed in one splash the offering is kosher. This, however, is based upon two conditions. First of all, the one splash must be above the base. Secondly, the blood must be placed on an area below one of the corners (קרנות) which protrude above the top of the altar. If one of these conditions is lacking, the placement is disqualified and the offering is not valid.

Rambam (Hilchos P'sulei HaMukdashim 2:10) records the ruling of the Mishnah by quoting it verbatim, but he describes the improper placement of the blood as being "being placed on the ramp, not above the base." Mahar"i Kurkos explains that it appears that Rambam does not understand the Mishnah as did Rashi, who explained that the description in the Mishnah is of two distinct misplacements of the blood. Melech Shlomo also notes that

## HALACHAH Highlight

*Is one obligated to wash after putting one's hand in a bathroom*

קסבר ביאה במקצת שמה ביאה

*He holds that partial entry is considered entry*

The Gemara presents a dispute whether the partial entrance of one who is tamei into the *azarah* is considered the same as though he entered entirely. Ulla in the name of Reish Lakish holds that even if one who is tamei puts his fingers in the *azarah* it is as though his entire body entered the *azarah* and he is liable to *kareis*. Ravina in the name of Reish Lakish holds that the tamei person who puts his fingers in the *azarah* is subject to lashes but is not liable to *kareis*. Ravin in the name of R' Avahu maintains that partial entrance is not the same as though he entered entirely and the tamei person who inserts his fingers in the *azarah* has violated only a Rabbinic injunction. Rambam<sup>1</sup> rules in accordance with the opinion that the tamei person is only liable to lashes whereas Ra'avad<sup>2</sup> holds that he is liable to *kareis*.

Tosafos<sup>3</sup> writes that even according to Reish Lakish who maintains that partial entrance is considered the same as entering entirely, this halacha is limited to a tamei person entering the Beis HaMikdash. However, regarding other areas of Torah all opinions agree that partial en-

*(Insight...continued from page 1)*  
Rambam holds that it was acceptable if the blood was placed along the western side of the ramp, as this side faced the base of the altar which was visible around the southwest corner of the altar. It would be unacceptable, however, if the blood was placed on the ramp along its eastern side, as this side did not face the base of the altar at all. ■

trance is not the same as complete entrance. Maharsham<sup>4</sup> notes that according to Tosafos if a person stretches his hand into a bathroom but the rest of his body remained outside of the bathroom, he is not required to wash his hands since the general principle of Torah is that partial entrance is not considered equivalent to having entered entirely. Rav Chaim Falagi<sup>5</sup>, however, disagrees and warns against inserting one's hands in a bathroom since such an act will necessitate washing one's hands. Ben Ish Chai<sup>6</sup> writes that when a person enters a bathroom he is required to wash his hands three times but if he only inserts his hands in the bathroom he is only required to wash each hand once since the degree of tum'ah that adheres to one's hands if only his hands were in the bathroom is limited. ■

1. רמב"ם פ"ג מהלי ביאת מקדש הי"ח.

2. ראב"ד שם.

3. תוס' חולין ל"ג: ד"ה דכולי עלמא.

4. מהרש"ם בדעת תורה או"ח סי' ד' סעי' י"ח.

5. ספר לב חיים ח"ב סי' ב'.

6. בן איש חי שנה ראשונה תולדות סעי' ט"ז. ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

*"It Will Be Sweet for Us from Now On"*

"מקבלה ואילך מצות כהונה..."

The Arizal explains that those who have emunah have a good life. Why? First of all, merely keeping Torah usually ensures that life goes fairly smoothly. And if not, *chas v'shalom*, a man with faith believes that everything is for the best, for a purpose. Perhaps he had unfinished business from an earlier incarnation which can only be rectified in a difficult—or even tragic—manner, God forbid. The man of faith does not

despair and continues to serve Hashem with as much joy as he can muster. Eventually he gets over the hardship or at least sees beyond it and learns to be happy since he connects to the spiritual joy of the mitzvos he fulfills each day. But when life gets hard for someone who lacks faith, he begins to feel as though it is not worth living. And according to his warped worldview, he is right.

The Divrei Yisrael of Modzhitz, zt"l, explains that the main point of this is actually encapsulated in Rashi and learns a similar lesson from today's daf. "Rashi writes on the verse, 'ועתה אם שמוע תשמע יערב לכם מכאן ולהבא' Torah upon us,

—it will be sweet for us from now on,' since all beginnings are difficult.

"Through this Rashi we can understand the statement of our sages in Zevachim 31: 'מקבלה ואילך מצות כהונה'—From the moment of *kabbalas ha'dam* and on in the preparation of the offering, the obligation is upon the kohen.' We can understand this figuratively. It is well known that a kohein represents kindness. From *קבלה*, from the point of accepting the yoke of heaven and onward, the mitzvos will be imbued with the *chesed* of the *kehunah*. They will be sweet for us since we will perform them in lovingkindness and ease."<sup>1</sup> ■

1. דברי ישראל, כללי אורייתא, דף כ"ג. ■