



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Slaughtering a korban at night in the Courtyard (cont.)

R' Yochanan's ruling that one is liable if he slaughters a korban at night in the Courtyard and offers it out of the Beis HaMikdash is successfully challenged.

2) Sacrificial parts put on the altar before the throwing of their blood

Ulla rules that sacrificial parts of kodshei kalim that are put on the altar before the throwing of the blood should not come down.

R' Zeira suggests a proof for Ulla from a Beraisa.

This proof is rejected.

Another proof for Ulla from our Mishnah is suggested.

The Gemara rejects this approach as well but in the process the Gemara suggests and analyzes many different possible interpretations of the Mishnah.

R' Chiya bar Abba reports that R' Yochanan and R' Ami had a discussion about whether Sacrificial parts of kodshei kalim that are put on the altar before the throwing of the blood should come down or not.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok reports a second version of this conversation.

3) Clarifying R' Akiva's opinion

R' Yochanan asserts that R' Akiva's validation of blemished animals is limited to cataracts in the eye and assuming that the consecration preceded the blemish.

4) Birds

R' Yirmiyah inquires whether the disqualification of "one that was sodomized" applies to birds.

Rabbah cites our Mishnah as proof that a bird that was sodomized may not be used as a korban.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok cites support for Rabbah's ruling from a Beraisa.

5) Clarifying the Mishnah

The novelty of R' Chanina Sgan HaKohanim's report that his father turned away blemished animals is explained.

6) Once brought down it is not brought back up

Ulla asserts that the Mishnah's ruling that substances that are brought down are not put back on the altar is limited to where the fire did not take hold but if the fire took hold of them they are brought back up.

There is a disagreement whether Ulla was commenting on the first part of the Mishnah or not.

7) MISHNAH: The Mishnah begins with a list of items that must be removed from the altar even if they were put onto the Altar. The next items presented by the Mishnah are substances that sometimes are allowed to remain and sometimes must be removed.

8) Elaborating on the Mishnah

A Beraisa elaborates on the teaching of the Mishnah. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

The flame of the Altar sanctifies disqualified items

כשם שאם עלה וכו' אמר עולא לא שנו אלא שלא משלה בהן האור, אבל משלה בהן האור יעלו. רב מרי מתני ארישא, רב חנינא מסורה מתני אסיפא

The Mishnah on 84a listed several cases of items which are disqualified for being offered upon the Altar. Among the list, some among them would not have to be taken off the Altar if they were placed upon it, while others should be removed even after they are placed there. The Mishnah concluded by saying that just as when these items are placed on the Altar they do not have to be removed, so too if they subsequently are removed from the Altar, they should not be replaced there.

In our Gemara, Ulla states that when the Mishnah taught that these items should not be replaced upon the Altar if they were removed, this is only true if the fire of the Altar had not yet burned them. Once the fire had begun burning these pieces, the pieces are the fuel of the Altar, and they are to be returned to the pyre even if they subsequently fall off or are otherwise removed.

Rav Mari learned that Ulla's comments were said in reference to our Mishnah, regarding disqualified pieces of offerings. Rav Chanina from Sura, however, understood that Ulla's qualification was actually said in reference to the next Mishnah, on the bottom of our daf, in reference to bones, sinews, horns and hooves that were placed on the Altar. These items have no purpose in being on the Altar at all, and if they were placed there, they are to be removed. Ulla added that once the fire begins to burn these items, they may remain there. Furthermore, if they then are taken off the Altar, they may be returned.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the status of sacrificial parts of kodshei kalim that are put on the altar before the blood is thrown?
2. Are korbanos skinned and dismembered on the altar?
3. What qualification does R' Yochanan add to R' Akiva's position?
4. What is the novelty that R' Chanina Sgan Hakohen's father rejected blemished animals for a korban?

HALACHAH Highlight

Redeeming a firstborn donkey with a sheep that is a tereifah

הקריבהו נא לפחתך הירצך או הישא פניך

Offer it, if you please, to your governor, will he show you favor or will he turn his countenance to you?

The Gemara relates that it is necessary to wash the innards of an Olah before offering them on the altar. The basis of this ruling is the pasuk that states (Malachi 1:8), "Offer it, if you please, to your governor, will he show you favor or will he turn his countenance to you?" Rashi¹ asserts that the same verse is the basis of the disqualification of using an animal that is a tereifah as a korban. Rambam² as well writes that an animal that becomes a tereifah may not be offered as a korban since one would not offer such an animal to his governor.

There was once a person who had a firstborn donkey that required redemption. He redeemed the donkey with a sheep and after the sheep was slaughtered they discovered that there was a lesion on the lungs of the sheep that rendered it a tereifah. This raised a concern that perhaps the redemption was not valid since one may not use a tereifah animal to redeem a first-born donkey³. Teshuvos L'horos Nasan⁴ cites Rashi⁵ who gave as an example of a tereifah animal that may not be used for the redemption of a first-born donkey an animal whose leg was severed above its knee. This indicates that the type of tereifah animal that may not be used is one that is visibly a tereifah but an animal that appeared intact and only after it was slaughtered was discovered to be a tereifah may be used. The basis of this position seems to be consistent with the reason he gives why a tereifah may not be used as a korban, i.e.

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Or HaChaim to Vayikra 6:2 explains that the verse refers to two aspects of the ability of the Altar to sanctify even disqualified items which are placed upon it. The verse reads, "It is the olah offering that stays on the flame, on the Altar all night until the morning." One is that anything that was placed "on the flame" may stay there. The other aspect of this halacha is "on the Altar." This teaches that items placed on the Altar may remain there.

Ulla learned (43a) that although the kometz of a mincha which was removed with piggul thoughts should not be placed upon the Altar, if it is put there and it is burned by the fire, the piggul prohibition is dismissed. This works even to the extent that if the kometz is later removed from the Altar that it should be replaced upon the Altar. Darchei Yosher (to 43a) notes that this is the source from which Ulla learns our halacha. We find that the prohibition of piggul can be dismissed with the kometz being placed upon the flame of the Altar, although it could have ruined the edibility of the remaining parts of an offering. It must be that this sanctification allows the acceptance of this portion. ■

one may not offer a korban that is not respectful to the governor. Despite the logic of this approach Teshuvos L'horos Nasan hesitates to issue a lenient ruling based on this approach since Shulchan Aruch rules that one may not redeem a first-born donkey with a tereifah animal and does not qualify the ruling in this manner. ■

1. ע"ד : ד"ה נפולה.
2. רמב"ם פ"ב מהל' איסורי ביאה הי"י.
3. שו"ת להורות נתן ח"ד סי' פ"ט.
4. שו"ע יו"ד סי' שכ"א סעי' ב'.
5. רש"י בכורות י"ב. ד"ה טריפה. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

"Present it to Your Officer"

"הקריבהו נא לפחתך..."

In a certain town they desperately needed to find a place to build a new building to serve as their shul. After much searching, an affordable building of an appropriate size was found. The problem was that it was a very used stable. The congregants wondered whether it was permitted to buy this building to make it presentable and use it for their shul. On the one hand, perhaps this was unseemly. Yet were they really required

to keep looking or pay more to buy a more respectable building?

When this question was brought before the Maharam Schick, zt"l, he explained that it was complex. "On the surface it seems obvious that this is prohibited. We find many such prohibitions throughout shas, based on the verse, 'הקריבהו נא לפחתך' – Present it to a human officer.' Although the Torah does not explicitly prohibit using such things for holy purposes, the application of this verse is a very powerful sevarah. And as we find in Kesuvos and elsewhere, a strong sevarah is min haTorah, since the Gemara there wonders why the verse says something obvious based on

sevarah.

"Yet this is only if the problem remains. But if they clean and scour it until there is no trace of its earlier use left, I rule that this is permitted since nothing revolting remains.

"Now although we find in Berachos that an outhouse which has been cleaned out should not be used for such a purpose, that is only if he plans on continuing to use that same space as an outhouse. But if he removed all sign of filth with the clear intention of transforming the space into a regular room, there is no longer a problem..."¹ ■

1. שו"ת מהר"ם שיק, או"ח, סי' ס"ז. ■