

22 Tammuz 5778
July 5, 2018



Zevachim Daf 83

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Bringing Blood Inside

Rabbi Yehudah had said: If the *Kohen* brought the blood in by mistake, it is still valid.

The *Gemora* infers from there that if he had done so deliberately, it is disqualified.

The *Gemora* inquires: When is this? Is it when he made atonement (*like Rabbi Shimon*), or when he did not make atonement (*like Rabbi Eliezer*)?

Rabbi Yirmiyah said: It was taught in the following *braisa*: Since it is written: *And the chatas bull and the chatas goat, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the Holy (shall be burned outside the camp)*; what is the torah teaching us by repeating the word “*chatas*”? It is because we have only learned that the bull and the goat of *Yom Kippur* are burned on the place of ashes (*and they contaminate the garments of the one who burns them*); how do we know the same of the other offerings which are burned? It is because “*chatas*” is repeated; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Meir said: That is unnecessary. Since it says: *And the chatas bull and the chatas goat, why was it necessary to say that “it is to make atonement” (this was already stated!)*? It teaches us regarding all offerings that atone in the Sanctuary – the one that burns them will cause his garments to become *tamei*.

It must be that Rabbi Yehudah does not understand “to make atonement” in that way, for he utilizes it for a *gezeirah shavah* (*that the blood of the outer chatas will become*

disqualified if it is brought into the Sanctuary – only if it was brought there to provide atonement – as Rabbi Shimon holds). (83a)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU,
KOL HAZEVACHIM

Mishna

The Altar sanctifies what is appropriate for it. Rabbi Yehoshua says: Whatever is appropriate for the fire of the Altar should not be taken off the Altar once it is put on. [*This is despite the fact that it became invalid after it was slaughtered.*] This is as the verse states: *The olah offering on its pyre*. This teaches us that just as an *olah* that is fit to be placed on the fire of the Altar should not be taken off (*even if deemed invalid*), so too anything that is fit to be placed on the fire of the altar should not be taken off (*once it has been erroneously placed there*). Rabban Gamliel says: Whatever is appropriate for the Altar should not be taken off the Altar once it is put on. This is as the verse states: *It, the olah offering, shall be upon the pyre upon the Altar*. This teaches us that just as an *olah* that is fit to be placed on the Altar should not be taken off, so too anything that is fit to be placed on the Altar should not be taken off. [*Both are including invalid sacrifices to be able to stay on the Altar, but are doing so from different verses. Rabbi Yehoshua derives from “the pyre,” while Rabban Gamliel derives from the extra “the Altar.”*] Rabban Gamliel and Rabbi Yehoshua differ only in respect of the blood and libations. Rabban Gamliel maintains that they do not descend, while Rabbi Yehoshua holds that they do descend. Rabbi Shimon said: Whether the



sacrifice is valid while the libations (*which accompany it*) are invalid, or if the libations are valid while the sacrifice is invalid, or even if both are invalid, the sacrifice should not descend, while the libations do descend. (83a)

What Goes Up, Doesn't Go Down

The *Mishna* had stated: whatever is appropriate for it. This indicates that whatever is not appropriate for it must go down. What does this exclude?

Rav Pappa said: It excludes a *komeitz* which was not sanctified in a service vessel. [*If it went up on the Altar, it must descend, for it was never designated for the sacrifice.*]

Ravina asked: Why is this different from that of Ulla's ruling? For Ulla said: If the sacrificial parts of *kodashim kalim* were brought up on the Altar before the sprinkling of their blood, they are not taken down, because they have become the food of the Altar!?

The *Gemora* answers: The sacrificial parts do not themselves lack an act, while the *kematzim* themselves lack an act (*in order to be deemed appropriate for the Altar*).

The *Mishna* had stated: Rabbi Yehoshua says: Whatever is appropriate for the fire of the Altar should not be taken off the Altar once it is put on. This is as the verse states: *The olah offering on its pyre.*

The *Gemora* notes that Rabban Gamliel uses this verse to teach that things which burst off from the Altar must be returned to the fire.

Rabbi Yehoshua derives this from the verse: *that which the fire consumed.*

The *Gemora* notes: That verse is required according to Rabban Gamliel to teach us that the parts of an *olah* which were partially consumed are returned, but you do not return

partially consumed incense, for Rabbi Chanina bar Manyumi the son of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov taught a *braisa*: *that which the fire consumed of the olah on the Altar*: the parts of an *olah* which were partially consumed are returned, but you do not return partially consumed incense.

Rabbi Yehoshua would counter that automatically (*after the verse taught us that you do not return partially consumed incense*) we derive that the parts of an *olah* which were partially consumed are returned.

Rabban Gamliel had stated: Whatever is appropriate for the Altar should not be taken off the Altar once it is put on. This is as the verse states: *It, the olah offering, shall be upon the pyre upon the Altar.*

The *Gemora* notes that Rabbi Yehoshua uses the word "Altar" to teach us that whatever is eligible for its pyre, the Altar sanctifies.

Rabban Gamliel would say that it is written another time, "Altar."

Rabbi Yehoshua says: One time teaches us regarding an offering where it had a period of fitness, while the other time is required where it had no period of fitness.

Rabban Gamliel would say that it is not necessary to be repeated for this, for since they are now invalidated, and the Torah included them (*that they can be sanctified by the Altar*), there is no difference whether they had a period of fitness or even if they did not have a period of fitness.

Rabbi Shimon had stated: Whether the sacrifice is valid while the libations (*which accompany it*) are invalid, or if the libations are valid while the sacrifice is invalid, or even if both are invalid, the sacrifice should not descend, while the libations do descend.



The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: Rabbi Shimon said: The Torah speaks about an *olah* offering: just as an *olah* comes on its own account (*and it will remain on the Altar*), so too all which come on their own account are included; therefore, libations, which come on account of a sacrifice are excluded (*and must be removed from the Altar – if they were invalidated and brought up*).

Rabbi Yosi HaGelili says that being that it says: *Whatever touches the Altar should become sanctified*, I understand that anything that goes on the Altar becomes holy (*and cannot be taken down*), even if it is not fit for the Altar at all. This is why the verse says, “*lambs*.” Just as lambs are fit for the Altar, so too this law only applies to things that are fit for the Altar. Rabbi Akiva derives this from the word “*olah*.” Just as an *olah* is fit for the Altar, so too this law only applies to things that are fit for the Altar. Both opinions are excluding things that are unfit, and learn this from different sources.

Rav Adda bar Ahavah says that the difference between them is a bird *olah* (*that becomes invalid*). The one who derives from “*lambs*” will not agree that this applies to a bird *olah* (*and if it becomes disqualified, it will be taken down*), whereas the one who derives this from “*olah*” will say that it applies to a bird *olah* as well.

The *Gemora* notes: If only “*lambs*” were written, I would have thought that the law applies even if the disqualified animals ascended the Altar while yet alive; and if only “*olah*” was written, I would have thought that the law applies even to a *minchah* offering.

Rav Pappa notes that the difference between these *Tannaim* and the *Tannaim* of our *Mishna* is in respect of a *komeitz* which was sanctified in a service vessel. According to our *Tannaim*, they do not descend (*for they were fit for the Altar and its pyre at the time of sanctification*); while according to the other *Tannaim*, they descend. (83a – 83b)

DAILY MASHAL

Limbs that fell off the Mizbeach before chatzos should be returned

There is a debate among the Rishonim how to categorize an act of damage caused by a fire set deliberately. The Nemukai Yosef opines it is categorized as an act of damage caused by an arrow, i.e. the act that creates the liability is the initial action of shooting the missile, or in this context, the initial lighting of the fire.

Despite this, the *Gemara* in *Taanis* 29a quotes R' Yochanan that if he would have been in the generation of the Destruction of the Beis Hamikdash, he would have designated the tenth of Av as the day of mourning instead of the ninth, since the 9th was when the fire was initially lit but most of the actual burning took place on the 10th.

The Beis Yechezkel explains that there is a distinction between liability for acts of damage which is a civil matter and the burning of the Beis Hamikdash. He brings a proof from our *Gemara* that when dealing with the burning of *kodshim*, we focus on the status of the burnt item and the time and extent of its burning, and we do not consider the start of the fire as the primary act of burning.