



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying R' Elazar's position (cont.)

R' Pappa and Ravina offer additional explanations of the dispute between R' Elazar and Chachamim regarding one who pours water outside of the Beis HaMikdash.

Another Baraisa presents a similar dispute but this time regarding the pouring of wine outside of the Beis HaMikdash.

R' Ada bar R' Yitzchok offers one explanation of the dispute.

Rava the son of Rabbah offers a second explanation of the dispute and then connects this dispute with another dispute between Tannaim.

The point of dispute between R' Yishmael and R' Akiva is explained.

2) Clarifying R' Nechemyah's position

R' Yochanan offers an explanation for R' Nechemyah's position.

This explanation is successfully challenged.

An explanation that could salvage R' Yochanan's explanation is suggested and ultimately accepted.

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the liability for offering a bird korban outside of the Beis HaMikdash.

4) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara exchanges the word הכשרו for the word חיובו.

The Gemara searches for the halacha with which R' Shimon disagrees.

Zeiri suggests one explanation of the dispute.

Rava offers another explanation of the dispute.

A final explanation of the dispute is recorded.

5) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses different cases of offering korban blood outside of the Beis HaMikdash. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Slaughtering at night in or outside of the Mikdash

וכן השוחט בהמה בפנים בלילה והעלה בחוץ פטור, שחט בחוץ בלילה והעלה בחוץ חייב. ר' שמעון אומר וכו'

The Gemara analyzes the Mishnah in order to understand the disagreement between Tanna Kamma and R' Shimon.

Zeiri explains that the case in which they disagree is where the animal was slaughtered at night inside the Mikdash, and the animal was then removed and offered outside the courtyard of the Mikdash. Tanna Kamma is the view of R' Yehuda (84a) who holds that an animal slaughtered at night inside the Mikdash is not valid at all, and it may not be brought as an offering. Even if this animal was inadvertently brought on the Altar it would have to be removed. Accordingly, if someone removed this animal and offered it outside he would not be liable, as this animal is disqualified as an offering. If, however, the animal was slaughtered outside and offered outside, there would be liability both for the slaughter of the animal and for offering it, because slaughtering an animal outside at night is a valid act. R' Shimon holds (ibid.) that an animal slaughtered at night in the Mikdash can remain on the Altar if it is placed there. Accordingly, he holds that slaughtering an animal outside at night is seen as a valid action, and one who does so would be liable for doing so.

This approach of Zeiri is opposed to the view of R' Yochanan on 84b, who says that according to R' Yehuda if an animal is slaughtered at night inside the Mikdash and offered outside there would be liability. The reason is that slaughtering at night in the Mikdash should not be more lenient than slaughtering outside the Mikdash, which is liable.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. Are libations poured on a bamahz?

2. Explain שׂירין מעכבין.

3. With which case does R' Shimon disagree?

4. What is the parable used by the Mishnah to explain the case of receiving korban blood in two cups?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Dr. and Mrs. Yudel Mayefsky
In loving memory of their father
הרב יצחק בן הרב משה, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
Mr. and Mrs. Israel Freund
In loving memory of their mother
מרת מרים בת ר' פנחס, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mr. and Mrs. Jonah Bruck
In loving memory of their grandmother
מרת רייזל בת ר' יעקב הירש, ע"ה
Mrs. Ruth Garber o.b.m.

HALACHAH Highlight

Liability for slaughtering a bird korban outside of the Beis HaMikdash

שחט בחוץ והעלה בחוץ חייב

If one slaughtered and offered [a bird korban] outside of the Beis HaMikdash he is liable.

The Mishnah rules that if one slaughters and offers a bird outside of the Beis HaMikdash he is liable. Rashi¹ explains that the person is liable for the slaughtering as well as for offering the bird. Rambam² and Ra'avad³ disagree why one is liable for slaughtering a bird for the sake of a korban outside of the Beis HaMikdash when in the Beis HaMikdash the correct procedure is to do *melikah*. Rambam explains that slaughtering a bird korban outside of the Beis HaMikdash is as acceptable as *melikah* inside of the Beis HaMikdash, therefore, one is liable for slaughtering a bird outside but not for doing *melikah* outside of the Beis HaMikdash. Zevach Todah⁴ further explains that when offering a bird on a *bamah* one slaughters the bird rather than *melikah*, thus liability for killing a bird outside of the Beis HaMikdash is for slaughtering. Ra'avad asserts that since liability for offering a bird outside of the Beis HaMikdash is patterned after the prohibition against offering an animal outside of the Beis HaMikdash, just as in the case of an animal liability occurs when one slaughters the animal so too when offering a bird, liability occurs when one slaughters the bird.

Mikdash Dovid⁵ offers the following explanation of this dispute. Is the prohibition against slaughtering a korban outside of the Beis HaMikdash based on the fact that the person is performing the service of the Beis HaMikdash outside of the

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Radba"z (to Rambam, Hil. Ma'asei HaKorbanos 18:17) explains that the reason for R' Yehuda is that it is not logical that the act of slaughtering at night inside the Mikdash should not be liable, while the same act done outside would be liable.

In addition, Rashi and Tosafos write that R' Yochanan holds that according to R' Yehuda if an animal for an offering was slaughtered at night, it would be removed off the Altar if it had been placed there, but that one would be liable for offering it outside, which is unlike Zeiri in our Gemara.

Kesef Mishneh (to Rambam, *ibid.*) notes that Rambam rules according to Zeiri, and not according to R' Yochanan, and the reason is that the Gemara (85a) concludes with a question against R' Yochanan. And although the Gemara does offer an alternative answer to its question, that answer is a bit difficult. ■

Beis HaMikdash or is it because slaughtering is prohibited, unrelated to the prohibition against doing the service of the Beis HaMikdash outside of the Beis HaMikdash since slaughtering is not one of the services? Rambam follows the first approach therefore it was necessary to explain that slaughtering a bird korban outside of the Beis HaMikdash is considered a form of service and thus one is liable. Ra'avad disagrees and maintains that the liability is because the Torah prohibits slaughtering a korban outside of the Beis HaMikdash even if it is not a service of the Beis HaMikdash. ■

1. רש"י ד"ה שחט.
2. רמב"ם פי"ח מהל' מעשה קרבנות הי"ח.
3. ראב"ד שם.
4. שבח תודה ד"ה וכן.
5. מקדש דוד סי' כ"ז סק"ח. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Reason for Korbanos

"היו הבמות מותרות..."

On today's daf we find that personal sacrifices were only permitted on private altars when there was no Mishkan.

There is a disagreement between Rambam and Ramban about the meaning behind korbanos. Rambam maintains that since the Jews lived among non-Jews who worshiped animals it was necessary to sacrifice animals on the altar to eradicate their influence.¹

Ramban argues that if Rambam was correct, why did Adam and his sons bring

sacrifices? Surely not to remove some insidious influence, since at that time no one worshiped animals!

The ibn Ezra explains that sacrifices come to help the sinner visualize that his sacrifice is being slaughtered in his own stead. After bringing this ibn Ezra, Ramban concludes that the korbanos are brought for hidden esoteric reasons.²

The Meshech Chochmah, *zt"l*, explains Ramban and attempts to reconcile both opinions. "Ramban means that sacrifices can be likened to generating electricity in the upper worlds. Through sacrifices, the kohen joins the heavenly spheres together—he 'closes a circuit'—and achieves great things on high.

"As far as the questions on the Ram-

bam, these can be reconciled by explaining that Rambam in Moreh Nevuchim was only discussing the reason behind sacrificing on private altars. But Rambam never meant to explain sacrifices brought in the Mishkan or the Beis HaMikdash."³

It seems clear from Rambam himself in Hilchos Me'ilah that sacrifices accomplish much more than merely removing the influence of non-Jewish idolaters. "All sacrifices are included in the chukim. Our sages taught that the world rests on the merit of sacrifices. It is by doing the chukim and mishpatim that the righteous merit a portion of the next world."⁴ ■

1. מורה נבוכים, פרקים לב ומ"ב
2. רמב"ן, ויקרא, א': ט'
3. משך חכמה, פתיחה לס' ויקרא
4. יד החזקה, הל' מעילה, פרק ח', הלכה ח'