

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The position of the Altar (cont.)

R' Shrivya concludes his interpretation of the Mishnah in Tamid proving that according to R' Yosi HaGalili the altar was located entirely in the north.

The proof that indicates that according to R' Yosi HaGalili the altar is in the north is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Gemara identifies the Tanna who disagrees with R' Yosi HaGalili.

2) A damaged Altar

Rav teaches that korbanos that were slaughtered when the altar was damaged are disqualified but he did not recall the pasuk that proves this point.

When R' Kahana went to Eretz Yisroel he heard an exposition that was the source for Rav's ruling.

R' Yochanan disagrees with Rav and maintains that even korbanos that were not slaughtered until the altar was repaired are invalid.

The Gemara identifies the point of dispute between them.

Rav's position that living animals are not rejected is unsuccessfully challenged.

A contradiction between two statements of Rav is noted and resolved.

The Baraisa that presents R' Yehudah's opinion is cited.

The Gemara elaborates on the opinions of R' Yehudah and R' Yosi in the Baraisa.

The exchange between R' Yehudah and R' Yosi regarding their respective expositions is recorded. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the degree of sanctity of the Ulam?

2. What is the point of dispute between Rav and R' Yochanan?

3. How big was the Altar constructed by Moshe Rabbeinu?

4. What is the point of dispute between R' Yosi and R' Yehudah?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Burning the ketores without the Inner-Altar

מזבח שנעקר מקטירין קטרת במקומו

On our daf, two statements of Rav are compared. Regarding the outer Altar, Rav rules that if it becomes damaged, all offerings that are slaughtered in the courtyard are disqualified. This is based upon the verse (Shemos 20:21), "You shall slaughter on it your olah offerings and your shelamim offerings." From here, we see that the slaughter of any offering is only valid when the Altar is complete, and not when it is in a state of being deficient.

The second statement of Rav is regarding the incense Altar, located in the Sanctuary. Here, Rav rules that if the Altar is removed, the ketores may be burned on the spot where the Altar is supposed to be located. The Gemara notes an inconsistency. If the Altar may be completely removed and the ketores may still be brought, how can it be that when the outer Altar is merely damaged that the service cannot continue?

The Gemara resolves these rulings by referring to a statement of R' Yehuda in the name of Rav in regard to the outer Altar. He said that although the offerings may be burned on the floor of the courtyard (in the case where Shlomo HaMelech sanctified the floor of the courtyard), yet, the service of the blood may only be thrown on the Altar itself. Our conclusion, therefore, is that it is true that the ketores may be burned on the floor of the Sanctuary if there is no inner Altar, and it is similarly true that the limbs of the offerings may be burned on the floor of the courtyard if there is no outer Altar. What may not be done without an altar, or if the altar is there but is damaged, is the placement of the blood.

Meshech Chochmah (Shemos 30:10) notes that the verse reinforces the need for the blood to be placed "on the horns of the Altar," while we do not find this emphasis mentioned in regard to the ketores. The reason, he explains, is from our Gemara. The placement of the blood had to be specifically upon the Altar, and without the Altar this service was suspended. However, the ketores could theoretically be burned on the floor of the Sanctuary, in the absence of the inner Altar.

This insight can also help highlight a contrast we find in the verses regarding lighting the menorah and burning the ketores. Regarding the Menorah, the verses (Vayikra 24:2-4) state that the oil for the lights must be arranged in the lamps of the Menorah. In reference to the ketores, the

HALACHAH Highlight

Offering korbanos without the Altar

מזבח שנפגם כל הקדשים שנשחטו שם פסולין

If the altar is damaged all the korbanos that are slaughtered there are disqualified

R' Yehoshua in the Mishnah in Eduyos (8:6) relates that he heard that it is permissible to offer korbanos even without a Beis HaMikdash since the sanctity infused into the place of the Beis HaMikdash was permanent rather than temporary. Although in other places the Gemara presents a dispute about this, Rambam¹ rules in accordance with those who hold that the original sanctity was permanent and continues even after the destruction of the Beis HaMikdash. This led Poskim² to discuss the possibility of offering korbanos even without a Beis HaMikdash. Numerous issues have to be addressed like matters of tum'ah and finding a kohen with the genealogy and knowledge of how to properly offer korbanos.

Rav Tzvi Hirsh Chiyos³, the Maharatz Chiyos, raises another issue mentioned by other Poskim. Even if we accept the premise that korbanos can be offered without a Beis HaMikdash, it is not possible to offer korbanos without the presence of the altar. Our Gemara teaches that if the altar is merely damaged all the korbanos that are slaughtered before

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Torah says (Shemos 30:36) only that the spices should be ground up and burned, and that it should be burned in the Sanctuary. No specific mention of the Altar is made, because, as we learned, it is the place that is critical, not the Altar, and the ketores could theoretically be burned on that spot on the ground. ■

the altar is repaired are invalid so certainly when the altar is not present altogether, it is not possible to offer korbanos. He then cites Tosafos⁴ who states explicitly that even according to the opinion that allows korbanos to be offered in the absence of a Beis HaMikdash, the presence of the altar is essential and korbanos cannot be offered in its absence. Additionally, the Gemara (62a) will relate that when the Jews ascended to Eretz Yisroel after the exile to Bavel, three prophets accompanied them and one of them testified about the precise location of the altar. This indicates that if not for the testimony of the Prophet regarding its location they would not have been able to build the Beis HaMikdash since they would not know the precise location of the altar. Since nowadays we do not have a prophet to tell us the location of the altar it is not possible for us to offer korbanos. ■

1. רמב"ם פ"ו מהל' בית הבחירה הט"ו
2. ע' שו"ת מהר"ץ חיות דלקמן
3. שו"ת מהר"ץ חיות סי' ע"ו פ"א
4. תוס' סוכה מ"א ד"ת דאשתקיד ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Placement of the Kiyur

משוך קימעא כלפי הדרום

The Rama, zt"l, provides a wondrous explanation of a statement on today's daf. "The Tzror Hamor, zt"l, teaches that a person must wash away all spiritual filth, as we find in Yeshayah, רחצו הזכו. It is for this reason that Hashem commanded us to make the *kiyur* and place water in it. Anyone who wishes to come close to Hashem and enter the environs of the Shechinah must first remove the foreign ideologies that defile both his body and his soul.¹ Based on this, we can understand why the *kiyur* was fashioned from mirrors. Washing ourselves represents the self-examination

that is the prerequisite of true internal change. This is also why we find in Zevachim 59 that the *kiyur* was positioned a bit south of the altar. The southern side where the menorah stood alludes to wisdom, as we find in Bava Basra. Purifying one's mind and attitude requires wisdom."²

Negative attitudes and false perspectives are easily overlooked. We must check our reflection carefully: Do things we say, although they are well meant, sometimes have a subtle tone of kefirah or leitzanus to them? When we have a question, are we sure to phrase it in a way that does not betray a lack of respect for the sages?

A certain person once asked the Alter of Kelm, zt"l, a very penetrating question. Based on his understanding there was a clear contradiction in the

sources that could not be reconciled. Although the Alter often fielded such difficult questions, he felt that the way the question was phrased revealed a kernel of apikursus in the questioner's heart. He immediately called out this young but brilliant student on his false beliefs and expelled him from the Talmud Torah when he would not recant.

Years later this very same student—now a famous gadol—always related with the greatest respect to the Alter. It was clear that he had no claim against the harsh treatment he had received. On the contrary, he understood that the Alter had been correct and changed himself for the better.³ ■

1. צרור המור פרשת כי תשא
2. תורת העולה ח"א פי"ד
3. מבית קלם אמונה ע' ק"צ