



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

Inside and Outside

The *Gemora* asks: In the case where he first applied the blood outside and then inside, it is understandable that he is liable, for all the blood is eligible to be applied inside; but where he applied the blood inside and then offered some outside, he should not be liable, for the blood offered outside is only the remnants!?

The *Gemora* answers: The *Mishna* is in accordance with Rabbi Nechemiah who maintains that if the remnants of the blood were offered outside, one is liable.

The *Gemora* asks: But if so, let us consider the next case in the *Mishna*: If he received its blood in two bowls, and applied both inside, he is exempt; if he applied both outside, he is liable; one inside and one outside, he is exempt. But why!? Didn't Rabbi Nechemiah say that if the remnants of the blood were offered outside, one is liable!?

The *Gemora* answers: This case is in accordance with the *Tanna Kamma* of Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Shimon who holds that the application from one cup of blood cause the other cup to become rejected (*and not a remnant*), and the *Tanna* that disagrees with Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Shimon is Rabbi Nechemiah. (112a)

Lost Chatas

The *Mishna* had stated: To what can this be compared? To one who designated his *chatas* and it was lost, and he designated another one in its place; then the first one was found, and both are in front of us.

The *Gemora* asks: Why is the comparison necessary?

The *Gemora* answers: The *Tanna* of our *Mishna* is following Rebbe who maintains if the first *chatas* was lost only when the second was designated (*but was found before he offered the replacement*), it must be left to die. [*The Sages maintain that in this case, the found chatas should be left to graze until it develops a blemish; it is left to die only if it was found after the replacement was offered.*] And this is what the *Mishna* means: This (*that he is not liable for slaughtering the other chatas outside*) is only if the first one was lost; if, however, one designated two animals for *chataas* as security (*if one should get lost*), one of these was predetermined to be an *olah* from the very outset. [*Therefore, one will be liable for slaughtering the second one outside, for it does not become disqualified when the first one was offered.*]

This (*that an animal left to graze becomes an olah*), the *Gemora* notes, is in accordance with that which Rav Huna said in the name of Rav: If an *asham* is put out to pasture (*i.e. in a case where its owner died*) and it was then slaughtered as a *korban* without specific intent for what *korban* it should be, it is valid (*as an olah, as this is its intended purpose*).

The *Gemora* asks: How can the cases be compared? There, the *asham* offering is a male and an *olah* offering is a male; but a *chatas* is a female!? [*How can it become an olah?*]

Rabbi Chiya of Yustinia answered: It refers to a *Nasi's* goat (*which is a male chatas*). (112a)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, HASHOCHEIT VEHAMA'ALEH

Mishna

If one burned the *parah adumah* (red heifer) outside of its designated place (a pit located on the Mount of Olives), or he offered up the Azazel goat (the one which was to be sent to a cliff to be thrown to its death) outside, he is not liable, since it is written: *and he did not bring it to the entrance of the Tent of Meeting*. Whatever is not fit to come to the entrance of the Tent of Meeting, one is not liable on its account.

If one offered up outside a *rovea* (an animal which has performed an act of bestiality), a *nirva* (an animal on which an act of bestiality has been performed), one set aside (to be used as a sacrifice for idolatry), one that has been worshiped, one that was used as a harlot's payment, one that was exchanged for a dog, *kilayim*, a *tereifah* or one born through caesarian section, he is exempt, because it is written: *before the Tabernacle of Hashem*. Whatever is not fit to come before the Tabernacle of Hashem, one is not liable on its account.

If one offered up outside a blemished animal, whether it was a permanent blemish or a temporary blemish, he is not liable. Rabbi Shimon says: If it was a permanent blemish, he is not liable; a temporary blemish, he transgresses a negative prohibition.

If one offered up outside turtledoves before their time has arrived or young pigeons after their time has passed, he is not liable. Rabbi Shimon says: Young pigeons after their time has passed, he is not liable, but turtledoves before their time has arrived, he transgresses a negative prohibition (*since they will eventually become fit for the altar*).

An animal and its offspring (*which cannot be slaughtered on the same day*), or an animal before its time, he is not liable. Rabbi Shimon says: He transgresses a negative prohibition, because Rabbi Shimon used to say that whatever will be fit at a later time, one transgresses on its account a negative prohibition, but does not incur *kares*. But the Sages say: Where there is no *kares* there is no prohibition either.

When he is exempt for offering it outside before its time, this applies whether by virtue of itself (*it is not yet in its eighth day*), or by virtue of the owner (*for it is before the time that he may offer this sacrifice*). What is a case where the animal is before its time by virtue of the owner? A *zav*, a *zavah*, a woman after childbirth or a *metzora* who have offered their *chatas* offerings and *asham* offerings outside are not liable; however, their *olah* offerings and *shelamim* offerings outside, they are liable (*for these would be accepted as voluntary offerings*).

If one offers up meat of a *chatas* offering, meat of an *asham* offering, meat of *kodshei kodashim*, meat of *kodashim kalim*, the remainder of the *omer*, the two loaves, the *lechem hapanim*, the remainder of the *minchah* offerings, or if he pours oil on a *minchah*, breaks it up into pieces, mixes it, salts it, waves it, brings it near, sets the *lechem hapanim* on the table, cleans the lamps of the *menorah*, takes off a *komeitz*, or accepts the blood outside, he is not liable.

Nor is one liable on account of these because of being a non-*Kohen*, or performing it while being *tamei*, or lack of vestments or not washing the hands and feet.

Before the Tabernacle was erected, the *bamos* were permitted, and the service was performed by the firstborn. Once the Tabernacle was erected, the *bamos* were forbidden and the service was performed by the *Kohanim*. *Kodshei kodashim* were eaten within the curtains of the Tabernacle, and *kodashim kalim* were eaten throughout the camp of Israel.

When they came to Gilgal, the *bamos* were permitted. *Kodshei kodashim* were eaten within the curtains of the Tabernacle, and *kodashim kalim* were eaten anywhere.

When they came to Shiloh, the *bamos* were forbidden. There was no roof there, but only a house of stones below and curtains above, and that constituted the "resting place" (*mentioned in the Torah*). *Kodshei kodashim* were eaten within the curtains of the Tabernacle, and *kodashim kalim* and *ma'aser sheni* were eaten anywhere within sight of Shiloh.

When they came to Nov and Giveon, the *bamos* were permitted. *Kodshei kodashim* were eaten within the curtains of the Tabernacle, and *kodashim kalim* were eaten in all the cities of Israel.

When they came to Jerusalem, the *bamos* were forbidden, and were never again permitted, and that constituted the “inheritance” (mentioned in the Torah). *Kodshei kodashim* were eaten within the curtains of the Tabernacle, and *kodashim kalim* and *ma’aser sheni* were eaten within the wall.

All sacrifices consecrated when *bamos* were forbidden, and offered up outside when *bamos* were forbidden are subject to a positive commandment and a negative prohibition, and one is liable to *kares* on their account. If one consecrated them when *bamos* were permitted, and offered them up when *bamos* were forbidden, they are subject to a positive commandment and a negative prohibition, but one is not liable to *kares* on their account. If one consecrated them when *bamos* were forbidden, and offered them up when *bamos* were permitted, they are subject to a positive commandment, but are not subject to a negative prohibition.

The following sacrifices were offered in the Tabernacle: Sacrifices consecrated to the Tabernacle, such as public offerings, were offered in the Tabernacle; private offerings may be offered on a *bamah*. Private offerings consecrated to the Tabernacle had to be offered in the Tabernacle, but if one offered them on a *bamah*, he was not liable.

How did the private *bamah* differ from a public *bamah*? The following were necessary by a public *bamah*: *Semichah*, slaughtering on the north side, sprinkling the blood all around the altar, waving the *minchah* offering and bringing it near. Rabbi Yehudah says: There was no *minchah* offering on a *bamah*.

The *Mishna* continues with its list of things that were necessary by a public *bamah*: *Kehunah*, priestly vestments, service vessels, pleasing aroma (it could not be roasted before being placed on the altar), the separating line (between the upper part of the

altar and the lower part) for the blood, the washing of the hands and feet. However, beyond its time intent, *nossar* and *tumah* were alike in both. (112a – 113a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

A Synagogue Rented in Exchange for Coffee and Sugar

In the last *dafim* of Zevachim the *Gemora* treats the laws of the Sanctuary (*mishkan*) and the *bamos*. As stated in the *Mishna*, the Sanctuary was moved from the desert to Gilgal, to Shiloh, Nov and Giveon till the Temple was built in Yerushalayim by King Shlomo. Once the Temple was built, sacrifices were forbidden to be offered outside of it but before that, when the Sanctuary was in Gilgal, Nov and Giveon, people could offer sacrifices on the *bamos* – altars erected in various places. The Tosefta states (Ch. 13, *beraisa* 8): “When *bamos* were allowed, a person could make a *bamah* at the entrance to his yard or garden and sacrifice on it – he, his son, his daughter, his servant and his maidservant.”

***Aliyah l’regel* before the Temple era:** Ramban (Devarim 16:9) raises a basic question: was the *mitzvah* of going up for the *regel* (yomtov pilgrimage) obligatory before the Temple was built? (See *ibid*, 12:8, that he asserts that there was certainly no obligation of *aliyah l’regel* to the *mishkan*, but that could have been only in the desert). Some proved this from that told about Elkanah (Shmuel I) who would go for the *regel* to the Sanctuary in Shiloh and from the *Gemora* in Chagigah 6a, which discusses the story in connection with laws of *aliyah l’regel*. Indeed, Maharatz Chayos (Responsa, 7, cited in *Piskei Teshuvah*, 309) wrote that it seems from Rambam that the *mitzvah* applied at the *mishkan* (and see *Sefer HaMaftaiach* on Rambam, *Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*, 1:1, and the remarks on Ramban, 12:8, in the Mosad HaRav Kook edition).

As sacrificing on a *bamah* became forbidden forever after the erection of the Temple, details of the laws of *bamos* were not cited in halachic works but it is interesting to discover how two different topics are influenced by the halachos of the *bamah*.



Is it permitted to remove the furniture of a synagogue? A certain community presented a question to the Chasam Sofer zt"l (Responsa, O.C. 32). Many years previously the community reached an agreement with the regional governor to rent a lot to build a synagogue and the rental was fixed to give him a *kikar* of coffee and a *kikar* of sugar each year. The price of coffee and sugar became excessive till the community found it hard to meet the demand and they wanted to forego the site. This suggestion, involving a few questions concerning dismantling a synagogue, was discussed by the Chasam Sofer and among the different subjects involved he asserted that the removal of furniture has nothing to do with the prohibition to dismantle a synagogue and even brought proof from the *bamos*, as follows.

It is forbidden to dismantle a stone of the altar. The Chasam Sofer concludes that this *halachah* applies to a *bamah* as the *halachah* of a *bamah* should be no less than that of a synagogue, which must not be destroyed. Not only that but even once *bamos* became forbidden, it was still forbidden to destroy the *bamos* which were erected previously. Nonetheless, David moved the Ark of the Covenant from one *bamah* to another, from Beis Shemesh to the home of Oved Edom and from there to the City of David. We thus see that it is allowed to move articles from a Sanctuary and this is not considered dismantling. (In light of the prohibition to destroy *bamos* even after the prohibition to sacrifice thereon, he explains why the upright kings of Judea did not destroy them and therefore the situation came about described by the prophets – “the people still sacrificed...on the *bamos*” – till King Chizkiyahu had to remove them to protect from sin; see *ibid* for another explanation).

Removing a knife from the table in *birkas hamazon*: We now proceed to our tables. It is an ancient custom to cover the knife during *birkas hamazon* (*Shulchan 'Aruch*, O.C. 180:5). One of the reasons is that the table resembles the altar. The altar must not be built with iron tools, as we are told – “...you shall not wield iron on them” (Devarim 27:5) – since the altar lengthens our lives and iron shortens them. Thus one mustn't leave a knife on the table, which resembles the altar. *Magen Avraham* (S.K. 5) writes that this custom is not heeded on Shabbos and holidays,

as explained in *Shulchan 'Aruch* (*ibid*), since on those days the altar cannot be built.

Why must the knife be removed at night? A few Acharonim wondered that if we don't remove the knife on Shabbos because on Shabbos we don't build the altar, then we shouldn't remove the knife at night because the Temple, including the altar, is not built at night. (Rambam, *Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*, 11:12; see *'Aroch LaNer*, Sukkah 41; *Revid HaZahav* on the Torah, end of *Yisro*; *Har Tzvi* and his remarks, *ibid*; etc.). HaGaon Rabbi Meir Simchah HaKohen of Dvinsk zt"l (*Meshech Chochmah*, Shemos 20:22) reconciles the custom: a *bamah* is also forbidden to be built with iron tools but is allowed to be built at night and therefore we should also remove a knife from the table at night.

DAILY MASHAL

The Sites of the Sanctuary and the Temple Are Hinted in the Verse

The Gaon of Ostrovtsa zt"l writes that it is indeed a wonder that the site of the Temple is not mentioned in the Torah. However, there is a hint in the verse “in the place that Hashem will **choose** (**yivchar**)” (Devarim 12:14). יוד יבחר is composed of the letters יוד ריש חית בית. The hidden parts of these letters – i.e., the parts that don't appear in the word – are וד ש ית ית וד whose numerical equivalent totals 1,130. The words ירושלים גבעון נוב שילה also equal that number! The Torah hinted in the word *yivchar* which places Hashem will choose to dwell in.