



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

Rules of Descending

Rish Lakish said: With regard to a *minchah* offering which comes by itself, all the *Tannaim* hold that it does not descend; but according to Rabbi Yosi HaGelili and Rabbi Akiva, it does descend. With regard to a *minchah* offering which accompanies a sacrifice, according to Rabban Gamliel and Rabbi Yehoshua it does not descend, while according to the view of all the others, it does descend.

Libations which come by themselves, according to the view of all of them, they do descend, but according to Rabban Gamliel and Rabbi Shimon, they do not descend. Libations which come together with a sacrifice, according to the view of all of them, they do descend, and only according to the view of Rabban Gamliel do they not descend.

The *Gemara* asks: Is this not all obvious?

The *Gemara* answers: He needs to state this on account of the *minchah* offering which comes by itself, and it is in accordance with Rava. For Rava said: A man can donate a *minchah* offering of libations every day (*even without being accompanied by an animal sacrifice*).

The *Gemara* asks: Then let Rish Lakish just teach us this law – just as Rava!?

The *Gemara* answers: He needs to teach the law about libations which come with a sacrifice, where he offers them on the day after he brought the sacrifice, or on some other day. For I might have thought that since a master said that their *minchah* offerings and their libations can be brought at night; and they can be brought on the next day, perhaps they are as libations which are brought by themselves, and Rabbi Shimon would admit that they do not descend. It is for this reason that Rish Lakish informs us that it is not so. (83b4 – 84a1)

Mishnah

The following do not descend once they ascended: That which was left overnight, that which left the Courtyard, that which became *tamei*, that which was slaughtered with a “beyond its time” intention or an “outside of its place” intention, or that which disqualified people accepted the blood or threw the blood (*if the sacrificial parts were put on the Altar, they should not be taken off*).

Rabbi Yehudah said: That which was slaughtered at night, or whose blood spilled, or whose blood went out past the curtains - if it ascended, it should descend. Rabbi Shimon said: It does not descend, because Rabbi Shimon said: if its disqualification was in the Holy, the

Holy receives it; but if its disqualification was not in the Holy, the Holy does not accept it.

The disqualification of the following were not in the Holy: An animal which sodomized a person, or a person who was sodomized by an animal, one that was set aside for an idolatrous sacrifice or if it was worshipped, one that was used for a harlot's payment or for a dog's exchange, a mixed breed, *tereifah*, an animal born by Caesarean section, and blemished animals. Rabbi Akiva ruled that blemished animals are valid. Rabbi Chanina the administrator of the *Kohanim* said: My father used to push away blemished animals from off the Altar.

Just as we say that if they were placed on the Altar they should not be taken off, so too if they were taken down they should not be brought up again.

And any of these, if they ascended to the top of the Altar while alive, they must descend. If an *olah* offering went up alive to the top of the Altar, it must descend. If one slaughtered it on the top of the altar, he must skin it and dismember it there. (84a1 – 84a3)

Disqualified in the Holy

The *Gemara* cites a *Baraisa*: Rabbi Yehudah said: [*This is the law of the olah, it is the olah, on the pyre, on the Altar, all night. This verse teaches us that once sacrificial parts ascend the Altar, it must not be taken down – even if the offering was an invalid one.*] “This,” “it” and “the olah” are three limitations: They exclude the following cases: an animal that was slaughtered at night; an animal whose blood spilled; an animal whose blood was carried out beyond the curtains. If any one of these ascended the Altar, it descends (*for the Altar does not*

sanctify them). Rabbi Shimon said: It is written: *olah*. I only know that a fit *olah* may remain on the pyre all night. From where do I know to include one which was slaughtered at night, or one whose blood spilled, or one whose blood was carried out beyond the curtains, or one whose sacrificial parts stayed overnight, or one whose sacrificial parts went out beyond the curtains, or one that became *tamei*, or one which was slaughtered with a “beyond its time” or “outside of its place” intent, or one whose blood was received or sprinkled by disqualified people, or one whose blood was applied below when it should have been applied above, or above when it should have been applied below, or outside the *Heichal* when it should have been applied inside, or inside when it should have been applied outside, or a *pesach* offering or a *chatas* which was slaughtered not for their own sake; from where do we know to include all these? It is from the verse: *the law of the olah*, which includes one law for all offerings that go up on the Altar that if they ascended, they do not descend. You might think that I should include in this rule also a *rove’a* (*an animal which has performed an act of bestiality*) and a *nirva* (*an animal on which an act of bestiality has been performed*), one which was set aside for an idolatrous sacrifice or one which was worshipped, a harlot's payment, or the exchange of a dog, or a mixed breed, or a *tereifah*, or an animal born through the caesarean section? The verse however states: *This (and no other cases) is the law*. And why are the former cases included and the latter cases excluded? I include the former, because their disqualification arose in the Holy, while I exclude the latter whose disqualification did not occur in the Holy (*but rather; before they were brought in*).



But Rabbi Yehudah infers his ruling from the following: Why did they say that if blood was left overnight (*past sundown*) it is valid (*if it ascended the Altar – it remains there*)? It is because if the sacrificial parts were kept overnight they are valid. Why are the sacrificial parts valid if they were kept overnight? It is because meat (*of the shelamim*) is valid if kept overnight. Meat that goes out is valid is because meat that goes out is valid on a *bamah* (*private Altar*). *Tamei* meat is valid because it was permitted in a communal service. A sacrifice which was slaughtered with a “beyond its time” intention is valid because it is effective in respect of its *piggul* status. A sacrifice which was slaughtered with an “outside of its place” intention is valid because it is compared to *piggul*. A sacrifice whose blood was received or sprinkled by disqualified people is valid because we are dealing with disqualified people who are eligible for communal service (*Kohanim who are tamei*).

The *Gemara* asks: Can you derive from what is its proper way (*shelamim left overnight*) to that where the same is not the proper way (*sacrificial parts*)?

The *Gemara* answers: The *Tanna* relies on the verse: *This is the law of the olah*. (84a3 – 84b1)

DAILY MASHAL

Elevating One's Status

Evidently, the Altar has in its power to take a hold of something completely rejected and elevates it from its prohibited status, and to turn it around that it is now permitted to offer it up on the Altar.

So too, this applies to a person, says the Sifsei Tzadik. A person possesses a spark of *kedushah* within him, and he can merit through this a complete turnaround – he can elevate his status before Hashem that he will be regarded as “bread of the Altar.” This can be done through strengthening oneself in even one area, one *mitzvah*, one act of Godliness.