



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Elaborating on the Mishnah (cont.)

The Gemara identifies the author of the previous cited Baraisa as Rebbi and cites his related position as recorded in a Baraisa.

R' Zeira qualifies Rebbi's ruling in the Baraisa.

This qualification is challenged and Rabbah suggests a revised version of this qualification.

The Gemara elaborates on the exposition that formulates the basis of Rabbah's explanation of Rebbi's ruling.

Rabbah's ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

It is noted that R' Elazar disagrees with Rabbah's ruling.

**2) MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses what should be done when things burst off the altar. The Mishnah teaches that the ramp and utensils also have the capacity to sanctify things.

### 3) Before and after midnight

The Gemara identifies the case in which the distinction of the Mishnah between before and after midnight applies.

Rav suggests a source for this distinction.

R' Kahana challenges Rav's exposition.

R' Yochanan responds to R' Kahana's challenge.

The Gemara presents a disagreement between Rabbah and R' Chisda concerning the status of hardened limbs that came off the Altar before midnight and were replaced by the kohen after midnight. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Explain the principle of פירשו ירדו.

---

2. What substances that burst off the altar are returned to the altar?

---

3. What is the source for a midnight cutoff for hardened limbs?

---

4. How does one add a morning to a morning?

---

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*To which items does the Mishnah refer?*

יכולן שפקעו מעל גבי המזבח

The law in our Mishnah (86a) is that although the disqualified items which the Altar sanctifies may remain on the Altar if they were placed there, if they fell off the Altar and upon the ground, they may not be replaced on the Altar.

Rashi explains that this halacha refers both to the list of items in the Mishnah on 84a, which were parts of disqualified offerings, and to the items on 85b, which were bones and sinews, which are items which have no place on the Altar at all.

Regarding bones and sinews, Rashi explains that we are only speaking about pieces which are connected to flesh. Rashi understands that the Mishnah is following the view of Rebbe (85b) who holds that the Altar does not sanctify bones and sinews by themselves. These items may remain on the Altar once they were placed there only because they were connected to flesh.

Tosafos (Me'ila 9a) explains, however, that the halacha of our Mishnah is only referring to the list from the Mishnah on 85b. We note that Tosafos understands the Mishnah according to the view of Chachamim, that the Altar does sanctify bones and sinews. Bones and sinews, whether connected to the flesh or whether they are separate, should not be replaced upon the Altar if they fall off. Rambam (Commentary to Mishnah, 9:5) explains that our Mishnah is only referring to the list of items from 84a, that pieces from disqualified offerings may remain on the Altar if placed there, but they may not be returned if removed.

Mishneh L'Melech (to Hilchos P'sulei HaMukdashim 3:9) writes that in Yad HaChazakah, Rambam (Hil. Ma'asei HaKorbanos 6:2) explains our Mishnah according to the understanding of Tosafos, which is the reverse of how Rambam explains our Mishnah in his Commentary to the Mishnah. There, Rambam learns that the pieces from disqualified offerings which fall off the Altar may be returned.

Zevach Todah explains the ruling of Rambam. We have a specific verse (Devarim 12:27, "The flesh and the blood") from which we learn that sinews and bones which come off the Altar are not to be returned. We therefore should not automatically include disqualified pieces of offerings in this rule without a specific verse. We also cannot automatically apply the rule of sinews and bones to the case of disqualified pieces of offerings, and say that they should not be returned to the Altar, because we learned earlier (43b) that once the disqualified pieces are placed on the Altar we con-

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Blowing a shofar taken from an animal that is prohibited for consumption

אבל פירשו קודם זריקה אתאי זריקה ושריתנהו

But if they separated before the throwing of the blood, the throwing of the blood permits them for benefit

Ran<sup>1</sup> suggests that a shofar taken from a non-kosher animal may not be used for the mitzvah of tekias shofar. The basis of this conclusion is the Gemara in Shabbos (28a) that teaches that when mitzvah items must be made from animals, one should use animals that are in theory fit for consumption. He then suggests that perhaps his conclusion is incorrect and the requirement to use kosher animal byproducts is limited to tefillin and therefore one would be permitted to use a shofar taken from a non-kosher animal for the mitzvah. Rema<sup>2</sup> rules that one should follow Ran's stringent approach and Magen Avrohom<sup>3</sup> explains that since there is a juxtaposition that equates the Torah to tefillin one should assume that the requirement that tefillin should be manufactured from a kosher animal fit for consumption applies to a shofar as well.

Maharsham<sup>4</sup> was asked to respond to the following challenge to Ran and Rema's stringent position. The Gemara Rosh Hashanah (28a) teaches that if one blew shofar with a shofar prohibited due to idolatry the mitzvah is **בדיעבד**

(Insight...continued from page 1)

sider it as if their defect has been removed. Therefore, there is an argument that these pieces should be able to remain, as opposed to sinews and bones. Therefore, Rambam learns, as did Tosafos, that only bones and sinews (and the list from 85b) may not be replaced on the Altar after they fall off. ■

fulfilled. The reason one should not in the first place use a shofar of idolatry is that idolatry is not considered something that is permitted for consumption since it is equated to a corpse. This indicates that at least **בדיעבד** the mitzvah could be fulfilled with a shofar that is prohibited for consumption. Maharsham answered that the reason that an object used for idolatry is prohibited for benefit is that idolatry is equated with a corpse. The restriction against deriving benefit from a corpse is based on the fact that a corpse is equated with the eglah arufah and kodoshim. Our Gemara teaches that the bones of kodoshim are permitted for benefit after the blood of the korban was properly applied to the altar. By extension, one could argue that bones of a corpse or animal used for idolatry may also be permitted for benefit. As such, one may use a shofar from an animal used for idolatry since it is a bone and is considered something that is permitted for benefit. ■

1. רי"ן ר"י"ה כ"י: ד"ה ומיהו אע"ג.

2. רמ"א או"ח סי' תקפ"ו סעי' א'.

3. מג"א שם סק"ג.

4. שו"ת מהרש"ם ח"ו סי' קי"ד. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The Ashes of Humility

"בכל יום תורם את המזבח..."

One time a group of young men were traveling with Rav Gershon of Yadnik, Hy"d, when they met with a man who obviously suffered terribly. They stopped to speak to him and he described his excruciating pain. As he finished explaining what he experienced, he commented, "In all six thousand years of creation there has never been a person who suffered as much as I do."

Rav Gershon comforted him for a long time to the amazement of the bochurim. When he finally went on his

way Rav Gershon commented, "Look at the power of arrogance. As if it was not bad enough that he suffers, he is also a ba'al gavah who believes he is unique in all of history!"<sup>1</sup>

The Alter of Kelm, zt"l, explains, "The verse in Mishlei states, 'גאות אדם — תשפילנו' — A man's arrogance lowers him.' Why? Because when we find that a person has arrogance this is a sign that he is on a low spiritual level. Clearly he lacks a desire to better himself spiritually, since if he was longing to attain the next level he would not be filled with arrogance. One who understands that he must advance cannot entertain pride since he knows that he is not complete. This is why one who indulges in this disgusting character

trait is lowered. Hashem diminishes him so he should be ashamed of his low level."<sup>2</sup>

The Maharal, zt"l, explains that this is the lesson of Terumas Hadeshen brought on today's daf. "One should never feel that if he removes his arrogance and makes himself as **דשן**, ash, by humbling himself he is lowered. Quite the contrary, he is uplifted. As the verse states, 'הרים את הדשן'.

"The rule is that one who humbles himself is uplifted while one who is arrogant is lowered. If one nullifies his arrogance and is nothing in his eyes like ash, he ascends on high and is one with Hashem."<sup>3</sup> ■

1. בית קלם, מידות, ע' שמ"ז

2. בית קלם, שם, ע' שמ"ב

3. נתיב הענוה, פ"ו ■