



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Korban blood brought into the Sanctuary (cont.)

The Gemara leaves unresolved the question of the status of the communal error bull or he-goat for idolatry whose blood was brought into Holy of Holies.

2) Blood brought into the Sanctuary with intention to be applied

A Baraisa elaborates on the dispute between R' Eliezer and R' Shimon regarding blood brought into the Sanctuary with intention to be applied.

The Gemara identifies the point of dispute.

The Gemara asks whether R' Yehudah maintains his position specifically when the kohen effected atonement or even when he did not effect atonement.

R' Yirmiyah cites a Baraisa and then explains how the Baraisa answers this question.

הדרם עלך כל הזבחים שנערכו

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah elaborates on the topic of the Altar's capacity to sanctify korban items that became invalidated.

4) Clarifying the Mishnah

R' Pappa explains the meaning of the phrase "fit for it."

Ravina unsuccessfully challenges this explanation.

The Gemara records the exchange between R' Gamliel and R' Yehoshua concerning their respective opinions and related expositions.

A Baraisa elaborates on R' Shimon's opinion and then presents R' Yosi HaGalili and R' Akiva's opinions.

R' Ada bar Ahava identifies the point of dispute between R' Yosi HaGalili and R' Akiva and explains their expositions.

R' Pappa identifies the point of dispute between the Tannaim recorded in the Mishnah and the Tannaim recorded in the Baraisa.

Reish Lakish begins a summary of the relevant halachos about which these various explanations differ. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Bringing the chattas blood into the Sanctuary for atonement

רבי יהודה אומר אם הכניס שוגג כשר

The Mishnah (82b) taught the halacha of the blood of an outer chattas which was brought into the Sanctuary. The rule is that this blood becomes disqualified, but only if it is brought in to effect atonement. The verse states (Vayikra 6:23) that the blood of a chattas is not valid if it is brought in "to effect atonement." We find three opinions in this matter. R' Eliezer holds that if the blood is brought in with the intent to apply it to the Altar it immediately becomes invalid, even without being applied to the Altar. R' Shimon holds that the blood becomes disqualified only after it is actually applied on the Altar. R' Yehuda holds that if the blood is brought in unintentionally, it is still valid.

The Gemara on our daf analyzes the view of R' Yehuda. The view of R' Yehuda seems to suggest that if the blood is intentionally brought in the Sanctuary, it will become disqualified. The Gemara asks, does R' Yehuda agree with R' Shimon, that once the blood is knowingly brought in, it still only becomes ruined when it is actually used for atonement, but not before, or does he agree with R' Eliezer that the blood becomes invalid immediately, even before it is applied to the Altar?

R' Yirmiya answers this question by citing a Baraisa which compares the blood of a chattas which is brought into the Sanctuary to the blood of a chattas of Yom Kippur. In that Baraisa, R' Yehuda does not use the word "לכפר" as part of his interpretation of the verse. The reason he does not use it is understood to be due to his already using the word for the גזירה שוה of R' Shimon, who says that no one

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between R' Eliezer and R' Shimon?
2. What is the point of dispute between R' Gamliel and R' Yehoshua?
3. What halacha is derived from the phrase עלה על מוקדה?
4. What is the point of dispute between the Tannaim of the Mishnah and the Tannaim of the Baraisa?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 By Dr. and Mrs. Samuel Saltzberg
 in loving memory of their father
 ר' יוסף בן ר' יחיאל דוד

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 לע"נ
 כ"ק אדמו"ר רב אברהם אייכענשטיין זצוק"ל
 בן כ"ק אדמו"ר רב יהושע העשיל
 אייכענשטיין זצוק"ל
 מזידיטשוב - שיקאגו

HALACHAH Highlight

The status of a bamah

ר' גמליאל אומר כל הראוי למזבח אם עלה לא ירד

R' Gamliel taught: Anything that if fit to go upon the altar, once it has gone up it should not be taken down.

R' Gamliel teaches that something that is fit to be placed on the altar does not have to be removed even if it should not have been put on the altar in the first place. Tosafos¹ writes that a bamah also sanctifies an invalid korban that was placed upon it and it does not have to be removed. Or Sameach², however, is uncertain about this matter. He suggests that the status of a bamah may hinge on the question of whether during the time that one could offer a korban on a bamah was it necessary to build an actual altar or could one offer a korban on any rock. If it is necessary to build an altar, then that altar also becomes infused with sanctity which allows it to make disqualified korbanos acceptable to the degree that they are not removed once they are on the altar. On the other hand, if a bamah does not require the construction of an altar, the stone upon which the korban is offered does not become infused with sanctity and consequently cannot sanctify a disqualified korban to make it acceptable. He then suggests that Tosafos's comment was based on the fact that he follows the opinion that maintains that a bamah must be constructed and that is why he rules that a bamah sanctifies disqualified korbanos.

Along the same lines Chidushei Hagrach³ expresses uncertainty about the status of disqualified limbs that were put on a bamah and taken hold by the fire. Do we hold in such a case that the limbs are allowed to remain on the bamah? One

(Insight...continued from page 1)

is allowed in the Kodesh when the Kohen Gadol enters to perform his service, even before he actually does the service of the blood. Accordingly, the Gemara concludes that R' Yehuda agrees with R' Shimon, and the blood of a chattas becomes disqualified immediately as it is brought into the Sanctuary, even before it is applied to the Altar.

Rambam (Hilchos P'sulei HaMukdashim 2:16) rules that if blood of a chattas is brought into the Sanctuary intentionally, the blood becomes disqualified immediately, even before it is actually used for atonement. If, however, the blood is brought in unintentionally, the blood only becomes disqualified once it is used for atonement. Rambam's view is discussed extensively among the commentators, as in our Gemara R' Yehuda did not mention any disqualification if the blood is brought in unintentionally.

R' Chaim HaLevi explains that Rambam holds that unintentional bringing of the blood is not for atonement, because it is a mistaken action. If the kohen does use it for atonement, this indicates that there was a purpose to bringing in the blood. ■

could argue that the halacha that once the fire takes hold of the limbs they are allowed to remain is a halacha that applies exclusively to the altar and does not extend to the bamah or perhaps the halacha is not a function of the altar and holds true even for a bamah. This seems to indicate that invalid korbanos that are placed on a bamah are not permitted to stay and the only question is if the fire has already taken hold of it. ■

1. תוס' לעיל י"ב. ד"ה יום.
2. אור שמח ה' פסולי המוקדשין פי"ג ה"ג.
3. חידושי הגר"ח אות תמ"ג. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Fit for the Altar

"המזבח מקדש את הראוי לו..."

The Pnei Menachem, zt"l, offered an inspiring explanation of today's mishnah. "On Zevachim 83 we find that what is fit for the altar need not be taken off once it was brought up. There is even an argument whether this even applies if one accidentally put nesachim or blood that was pasul on the altar. Rabbi Shimon holds that if anything pasul is offered with the korban—or if the

korban itself has a pesul or both the korban and the nesachim are psulim—the sacrifice is offered but the nesachim are removed.

"It is possible to apply this to our avodah if we consider that Rabbi Shimon is going according to his opinion in Sukkah. There we find that he says that he can discharge the entire world from judgment. This is the meaning of the statement that all sacrifices that are psulim which are brought up—through the merit of a tzaddik—remain in their elevated state.

"But there is one pesul that Rabbi Shimon admits must be taken down

from the mizbeach. This is an animal which has a blemish. In terms of avodah, this alludes to an arrogant person, as we find, 'האי מאן דיהיר בעל מום'— 'One who is arrogant bears a blemish.'

"But if the sacrifice has any other pesul, if it is brought up on the altar, it is not taken down. This teaches the great power of a ba'al teshuvah who can overcome any blemish. Yet arrogance is still a problem since he could become even more conceited because of his repentance!"¹ ■

1. פני מנחם, ויקהל פיקודי, תשנ"ד, ע' רל"ג. ■