

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Female Asham (cont.)

The Gemara completes an unsuccessful challenge to R' Avin bar Kahana's ruling that the male offspring of a female designated as an asham can be offered as an olah.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah begins with the halachos that relate to the temurah of a bechor or ma'aser animal. The differences between a blemished bechor and a blemished ma'aser are enumerated. R' Shimon explains why bechor and ma'aser animals need not be brought from outside of Eretz Yisroel.

3) Inflicting a blemish on the temurah of a bechor or maaser

Rava bar R' Azza inquires whether one who inflicts a blemish on the temurah of a bechor or ma'aser has violated the prohibition against inflicting a blemish on a bechor or ma'aser.

Abaye demonstrates that no lashes are given.

A second version of this discussion is presented and the inquiry relates to the ninth animal that was called tenth.

4) Bechoros brought from outside of Eretz Yisroel

A Baraisa is cited that contradicts our Mishnah's ruling that a Bechor brought from outside of Eretz Yisroel is offered as a korban.

R' Chisda answers by differentiating between R' Yishmael and R' Akiva who disagree about this point in a Baraisa.

The Gemara interrupts its citation of the Baraisa to clarify the logic of an exposition of the Baraisa.

The Gemara continues its citation of the Baraisa.

The rationale behind Ben Azzai's thinking in the Baraisa that one could eat maaser sheni outside of Yerushalayim as long as one could see its walls, is explained.

The Gemara completes the citation of the Baraisa.

The exchange between Acheirim and the other Tanaim concerning their expositions is recorded.

הדרן עלך אלו קדשים

5) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses Chataos and offspring and temurahs of Chataos that are left to die. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

The area within visual range of Shiloh

שבשילה אוכלין קדשים קלים ומעשר שני בכל הרואה

Our Gemara cites the Mishnah in Megillah (9b) which says that there was no significant difference between when the Mishkan was at Shiloh and when the Beis HaMikdash was in Yerushalayim other than the halacha regarding eating kodoshim kalim and ma'aser sheni. In Shiloh, kodoshim kalim and ma'aser sheni were allowed to be eaten in all places which were in direct visual sight of the Mishkan. However, regarding Yerushalayim these items were only allowed to be eaten within the walls of Yerushalayim, but not beyond the walls to the areas which were in direct visual range.

Sfas Emes (to Zevachim 112b) writes that kodoshim kalim and ma'aser were allowed to be eaten beyond Shiloh in cities located in Eretz Yisroel, but not in cities outside Eretz Yisroel, even if they were in visual range of Shiloh. He derives this rule from the verse (Devarim 33:16), "by the goodwill of the One Who rests in the thornbush." The Gemara comments that kodoshim from the Mikdash in the territory of Yosef (from the Mishkan at Shiloh) were allowed to be eaten in the areas of the other tribes, even though the other tribes despised Yosef. This suggests that these kodoshim may only be eaten in the areas of the other tribes, as opposed to places outside Eretz Yisroel.

The Gemara in Zevachim (116b) tells us that in the desert and in Yerushalayim there were three distinct camps. Within the courtyard in the Mishkan in the desert and within the Nikanor Gate of the Beis HaMikdash in Yerushalayim was "the camp of the presence of God—the Shechina." Surrounding it was the "camp of the Levi'im." In the desert this was the area where the levi'im lived, and in Yerushalayim it

Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. In what regard are bechor and ma'aser different from other korbanos?

2. What is the source that ma'aser sheni is not brought to Yerushalayim nowadays to be eaten?

3. What is the source that a bechor does not have to be brought from outside of Eretz Yisroel into Eretz Yisroel?

4. What is the procedure for the "five chattaos"?

HALACHAH Highlight

Atonement for the deceased

וחטאת שמתו בעליה

A Chattas whose owners have died

The Mishnah teaches that if a person designates an animal for a chattas and the owner dies the animal is not offered as a korban. Rashi¹ notes that an animal that was designated as a voluntary offering may be offered even after the owner died in contrast to this halacha of the chattas that is not offered after the owner died. The reason for this discrepancy is based on the Gemara in Horayos (6a) that teaches that there is no atonement for the deceased since their death already provided them with atonement. Therefore, since a chattas is designed to provide atonement, once the owner is dead he no longer needs the atonement afforded by a chattas.

The Gemara in Horayos, however, concludes that the principle that the deceased do not receive atonement is limited to taking a step to provide atonement for the deceased himself. If the atonement for the deceased is coupled with the atonement of someone who is alive both parties receive atonement. For this reason there was a custom² in some places that when they make a *מי שברך* for someone on Yom Kippur the gabbai mentions the person as well as his deceased father. The reasoning is that once one is mentioning in the beracha the person who received an aliyah one can include as well even those who are already deceased.

Based on this approach Sefer Tzemach Yehudah³ explains the basis of the custom for the rov to offer words of rebuke

(Insight...continued from page 1)

was the Temple Mount. Anyone with tum'ah due to bodily emissions (zav, niddah, ba'al ker) had to evacuate beyond this area. The third area was the "camp of yisrael," which was the area where the Jews camped in the desert, and corresponding to it was the entire city of Yerushalayim. A metzora was sent outside this area.

The Amoraim disagree regarding the camps surrounding Shiloh. Rabba holds that there were only two camps at Shiloh, that of the Shechinah and that of the levi'im. Rava says that there was also a camp of yisrael at Shiloh. Keren Orah explains that according to Rava, the camp of yisrael was the entire area within visual range of Shiloh. Sfas Emes explains that all agree that a metzora had to be sent beyond the visual range of Shiloh, because kodoshim were able to be eaten there. When he says that there were only two camps, he means that because there was no physical fence or boundary around this area, it cannot be called a "camp." Gri"z (to Parashas Re'eh, "בספרי") says that Rabba holds that there was no third camp at Shiloh, and a metzora was not sent out of the visual range of the Mishkan there. ■

before the recitation of yizkor. The reasoning is that if the people are inspired to repent before reciting yizkor their prayers and righteousness will be elevated to the point that it will be beneficial to the deceased. If the people were not inspired to repent before yizkor their prayer and pledge would be nothing more than a means of providing the deceased with merit but would not provide them with atonement. ■

1. רש"י מעילה י: ד"ה ולד.
2. מנהג מרשלייאה סדר תפילת יו"כ עמ' 136-137.
3. ספר צמח יהודה ח"א סי' כ"ג. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Holy Impressions

אלא שבשילה אוכלין קדשים קלים ומעשר שני בכל הרואה

The Kotzker Rebbe, zt"l, taught a very inspiring lesson from a statement on today's daf. "Shilo was in the portion of Yosef. The verse, 'בן פורת עלי עין' — He is a fruitful vine upon a spring' — was said in reference to Yosef. Why was this place specifically given to him? It is here that Yosef searched for his brothers, looking here and there, until he sanctified the entire place with his holy gaze. For this reason, he merited this particu-

lar portion and the Mishkan was on his land for a time. And when the Mishkan stood in Shilo, it was permitted to eat kodoshim as long as one could see the Mishkan, as we find in Temurah 21."¹

When Rav Yisrael Salanter, zt"l, visited a certain city in Russia where Jews were not allowed to live, he was walking late at night when he heard bitter crying. When he went to investigate, he found a Jewish soldier acting as a sentry reciting tikkun chatzos as he shed copious tears.

Many years later, Rav Yisrael visited the same city—in which Jews were finally allowed to live. He immediately sought out the location where the soldier had mourned the galus every night so long

before. To his delight he found a beautiful shul in the very place of the soldier's devotions.

When he later told this story he commented, "Surely many people worked hard to build that shul. They think that it was erected in their merit, but they are incorrect. Although they were God's instruments, it is the soldier's tearful prayers for the exile of the Shechinah that really built that shul. His ability to mourn despite—or possibly because of—his personal struggles, caused this place to be chosen for a shul in which Jews will praise God for generations!"² ■

1. שיח שרפי קודש, ח"א, אות שצ"ח
2. דברי יונה, ח"א, ע' רמ"ד ■