



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

Eating while Traveling

When Ravin went up (to Eretz Yisroel), he said over this teaching (of *Abaye* that *kodashim kalim* cannot be eaten when the Altar is damaged) in front of Rabbi Yirmiyah, whereupon he observed: The Babylonians are fools. Since they dwell in a land of darkness they teach dark teachings. Have they not heard what was taught in the following *braisa*: During the dismantling of the Mishkan on their journeys, sacrifices became unfit (for consumption; and the Gemora thinks that this is because the Altar has been removed from its place), and *zavin* and *metzoraim* were sent out of the camps (even though they were traveling, the camps remained intact, and a *metzora* had to leave all three camps, whereas a *zav* had to leave the Levites’ Camp).

Whereas another *braisa* taught: Sacrifices may be eaten in two places (when the Mishkan was standing and when it was dismantled as well)! Surely then, the answer must be that the first *braisa* refers to *kodshei kodashim* (which cannot be eaten while they were traveling), and the latter one refers to *kodashim kalim* (which may be eaten; this challenges *Abaye’s* ruling)!?

Ravina answers: Both *braisos* refer to *kodashim kalim*, yet there is no difficulty, for the first *braisa* follows the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael, and the second *braisa* is in accordance with the Rabbis.

Alternatively, it is possible to answer that they are both referring to *kodshei kodashim*. What, then, does the second *braisa* mean when it says that *kodashim* are eaten in two places? It means before the Levites “set up” the Mishkan, and after it was dismantled. [*Rashi* explains that one of the

two places refers to the time when the Mishkan was built. The other does not actually mean before it was set up, but rather after the beams and curtains of the Courtyard etc. were taken down but the Altar was still in its place. The Gemora is stating that even when the outer structure had already been taken down, *korbanos* could still be eaten if the altar was still in its place.] One might think that the *kodshei kodashim* are now considered to be invalid, and should be considered as if they went out of the courtyard of the Mishkan (as the structure of the courtyard of the Mishkan was taken down, rendering them invalid). This is why the *braisa* states that they can still be eaten.

The Gemora asks: Why, indeed, do we not say that these *korbanos* should be considered invalid because they are no longer in the courtyard of the Mishkan?

The Gemora answers: The verse states: *And the Tent of Meeting traveled*. Even though it started traveling, it is still called the Tent of Meeting. (60b – 61a)

Copper and Golden Altars

Rav Huna says in the name of Rav: The Altar of Shiloh was made of stones. This is as the *braisa* states: Rabbi Elozar ben Yaakov says that the verse states three times, *stones* (regarding the building of the Altar). One is alluding to the Mishkan of Shiloh, one is alluding to when the Mishkan was in Nov and Givon, and one is alluding to the Eternal Temple.

Rav Acha bar Ami asked a question on this from a *braisa*. The *braisa* states: The fire that came down from the heavens during the time of Moshe did not depart from the copper



Altar until the time of Shlomo. The fire that came down from the heavens during the time of Shlomo did not depart until Menashe came and caused it go away (*by promoting idolatry and destroying the Altar*). If the Altar was already made of stones during the time of Mishkan Shiloh, the fire departed from that Altar long before the times of Shlomo!?

The *Gemora* answers: This opinion must hold like Rabbi Nassan. Rabbi Nassan says in a *braisa*: The Altar of Shiloh was made of hollow copper and filled with stones (*which was obviously not the same as that of Moshe's, which was filled with earth*).

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak answers: What does it mean that it did not depart? It means that it did not depart completely (*to be totally nullified; and no longer exist on the copper Altar until the time of Shlomo*).

The *Gemora* asks: What exactly happened (*with this fire*) during the time of Mishkan Shiloh?

The Rabbis say: It would send sparks and flames (*from the copper Altar of Moshe to the stone Altar of Shiloh, whenever they would offer korbanos on the stone Altar*).

Rav Pappa says: The fire would sometimes go on one (*Altar*), and sometimes on the other. (61a – 61b)

Adding to the Altar

The *Gemora* cites a *Mishna*: When the people from the exile came up to *Eretz Yisroel*, they added four *amos* to the southern part of the Altar, as well as four to the western part, forming the shape of a Greek letter *gamma* (*like our letter L*). [*Initially it was twenty-eight amos square, and now it was thirty-two.*]

The *Gemora* asks: Why did they do this?

Rav Yosef answers: There simply was no longer enough room on the Altar.

Abaye asks: If in the time of the first Beis HaMikdash the verse states: *Judah and Israel were many, like the sand on the seashore*, and yet the Altar was big enough for them, certainly it should have been big enough in the times of the second Beis HaMikdash, regarding which the verse states: *The entire congregation together was forty-two thousand etc.!*?

Rav Yosef answered: In the time of the first Beis HaMikdash, the heavenly fire helped them (*as it quickly consumed the korbanos*). In the time of the second Beis HaMikdash, they did not have help from Heaven.

When Ravin came up from *Eretz Yisroel*, he said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi, who said in the name of Bar Kappara: They added to the Altar because of the *shissin*. [*In Shlomo's Temple there was a hole in the ground near the southwestern corner of the Altar. The libations flowed down the side of the Altar into those holes, leading to these deep subterranean cavities, called shissin. But in the second Temple, the Altar was extended on the south and the west, so that the place of the hole was directly under the Altar. They made holes in the top of the Altar for the libations to flow into the shissin below.*]

The *Gemora* explains why they did not do this in the first Temple: Initially they had thought that an "Altar of earth" meant that it was to be filled with earth (*and a hole could not be made*). Subsequently they held that "drinking" (*the libations*) must be like "eating" (*and the libations must go directly through the Altar*); and what does an "Altar of earth" mean? It means that it should be attached to the earth, not built on arches or cavities. (61b – 62a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Traveling with the Fire on the Altar

The *Gemora* says that the fire that came down from the heavens during the time of Moshe did not depart from the copper Altar until the time of Shlomo. The fire that came down from the heavens during the time of Shlomo did not depart until Menashe and removed it.

Kollel Iyun HaDaf poses the following question: Rashi in his commentary on Chumash (Shemos 30:3) cites the Mechilta which contrasts the *Mizbe'ach ha'Ketores* to the *Mizbe'ach ha'Nechoshes*. The verse says that the *Mizbe'ach ha'Ketores* had a solid top, while, says the Mechilta, the *Mizbe'ach ha'Nechoshes* did not have such a top. The *Mizbe'ach ha'Nechoshes* was transported merely as a frame, and at each stop in the desert its hollow interior was filled with dirt. The Netziv (Shemos 27:2) therefore questions Rashi's words from the *Gemora* here, which states that the fire descended and stayed on the *Mizbe'ach*. If the earth inside of the hollow of the *Mizbe'ach* was removed and the *Mizbe'ach* dismantled each time the Jewish people embarked on a new journey, then where was the fire?

HaRav Dovid Meyers, author of the fabulous sefer on the construction of the Mishkan, Melech HaMishkan V'Kailav, answers as follows: Firstly, according to the Malbim (Shemos 20, posuk 21) there is an argument in Mechilta whether the *Mizbe'ach* was carried with the dirt or not. The Malbim also brings another dispute if the fire was on the *Mizbe'ach* when they traveled or not. The Malbim explains that if the fire remained, then the *Mizbe'ach* was filled with dirt when they carried it. If it did not remain, then it was carried without dirt.

According to the Shitah Mekubetzes on our Daf (letter 6), in the time they traveled, the fire rested on the edge of the *Mizbe'ach*.

According to Raaviah (chelek sheini Maseches Chagigah siman 808), the fire rested on a clump of dirt carried with the *Mizbe'ach*.

According to Anaf Yosef on Tanchuma (Terumah 11) they put a tablet on the *Mizbe'ach* and it rested on it.

According to Tosafos HaSaleim (Shemos 38, 6-7, letter 1), even according to Rashi, the *Mizbe'ach HaNechshes* had a top.

The Kollel cites the following answers: The Netziv explains that the *Gemora* argues with the Mechilta and maintains that the *Mizbe'ach ha'Nechoshes* did have a top on which the fire rested even during the journeys. He finds support for this assertion in the Midrash Tanchuma. He explains that the way the *Mizbe'ach* was filled with earth was through the bottom of the *Mizbe'ach*, which had no floor. Upon their arrival at a new location, the Jewish people would make a mound of earth and place the *Mizbe'ach* over it, effectively filling the *Mizbe'ach* with earth. When they would leave, they would lift the *Mizbe'ach*, leaving the earth in its place.

This also seems to be the opinion of the Kereisi u'Pleisi (43:5). The *Gemora* in Chagigah (27a) derives through a *kal va'chomer* from the *Mizbe'ach ha'Zahav* that the fire of Gehinom does not affect the transgressors among the Jewish people. Even though the gold covering the top of the *Mizbe'ach ha'Zahav* was only the thickness of a *dinar* coin, it was not diminished at all throughout the years that it had a fire burning on it. Certainly, then, the transgressors among the Jewish people -- who are full of *mitzvos* like a pomegranate -- will not be affected by the fire of Gehinom (see Insights to Chagigah 27a).

Tosfos in Chagigah there (DH she'Ein) is bothered by a question, as the Kereisi u'Pleisi explains his words. Why does the *Gemora* learn this *kal va'chomer* from the *Mizbe'ach ha'Zahav*, and not from the *Mizbe'ach ha'Nechoshes*? The only thing offered on the *Mizbe'ach ha'Zahav* was the incense offering, which was burned there once at the beginning of the day and once at the end of the day. There was much more activity on the *Mizbe'ach ha'Nechoshes*,

which had a fire on it at all times, and it too had a coating of gold that did not diminish!

Since the Kereisi u'Pleisi says that the *Mizbe'ach ha'Nechoshes* had a coating of gold on its top, it is clear that he maintains that the *Mizbe'ach* had a top, like its counterpart, the *Mizbe'ach ha'Zahav*.

The *Gemora* here may be understood even according to Rashi's assertion that the *Mizbe'ach ha'Nechoshes* had no top, based on the words of the Shitah Mekubetzes (#6). Rashi here (DH Lo Nistalkah) comments that while the Jewish people traveled in the desert, they used to turn a certain type of vessel over the fire on the *Mizbe'ach* to preserve the fire. This is the opinion of Rebbi Yehudah in Toras Kohanim (Tzav 2:10; see Rash mi'Shantz), and not the opinion of Rebbi Shimon who says that the fire was removed from the *Mizbe'ach*. This is also the way Rashi explains in Bamidbar (4:13), where he says that the cover of the *Mizbe'ach* was not burned by the fire underneath it while traveling, due to the vessel which was placed over the fire. If there was no actual top to the *Mizbe'ach*, though (but rather its frame was filled to the top with earth), and the earth inside of it was removed when the people traveled, where could they place the vessel to contain the fire? The Shitah Mekubetzes explains that they placed the vessel "over the edge" of the *Mizbe'ach*. This means that the fire on the *Mizbe'ach* remained on top of the frame of the *Mizbe'ach*, covered by this vessel.

DAILY MASHAL

Rav Tzadok points out that 'Levona,' which is one of the ingredients in the Ketores [Incense] that we offer on the Golden Altar, has a very bad odor. It seems strange that on the altar where we are trying to offer a 'Reyach Nichoach' (a pleasant smelling aroma), we mix in an ingredient with a bad odor. The symbolism, of including this ingredient in the mixture, is that we are demonstrating that even if a Jew has 'a bad odor' -- is not acting like he is supposed to -- he still has a place in the Temple of G-d. Even this Jew, who is far

removed from the ways of Torah, is to be included, because he too has a place in the Torah of Hashem our G-d. Rav Tzadok says that is why this chapter is included after the chapter of the Kohanim in Titzaveh. Perhaps the reason why Aharon the High Priest merited the Priesthood was because he was one who was 'A lover of peace, and a pursuer of peace; one who loved all people and drew them nearer to Torah.' [Avot 1:12] The function of the Kohanim was to bring peace between the Ribbono shel Olam and Klal Yisroel. Therefore, Aharon, who was a natural at this function, had the merit to be assigned this job for himself and for his children. After the Torah establishes that Aharon and his family, who possessed these talents for drawing people near to Torah, were assigned the role of Priesthood, then the Torah starts the chapter of the Golden Altar. The Ketores, which is burned on this Golden Alter, includes the ingredient of Levona, which has a 'bad odor'. The lesson is that even a Jew who is far removed, has to be included in the Temple ritual -- and including those who are far removed from Torah is precisely what the Kohanim are best suited to do.