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

The Third and Fourth Camp

The *Baraisa* states: Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai says that there was another (*fourth camp, i.e. area*) of the Beis Hamikdash called the *cheil* of the women's section. People would not be punished if they entered while impure (*for it was a Rabbinic decree*). However, in Shiloh there were only two camps.

The *Gemara* asks: Which camp was not in Shiloh?

Rabbah answers: It must be that the camp of the Levites was in Shiloh. If it was not, the *zavim* (*a man who has an emission similar but not identical to a seminal discharge*) and people who were impure from corpse *tumah* would only be sent out of one camp. Yet the Torah states: *And they should not make their camps impure.* [*This indicates that people impure from corpse tumah are sent out of a certain camp (camp of the Shechinah), while zavim are sent out of another camp (the Levite camp*.] This must mean there was no Israelite Camp.

Rava said to him: Are you saying there was no Israelite Camp? This means that *zavim* and those that had *tzara'as* are sent to the same area (*outside of the camp of the Shechinah and the camp of the Levites*). However, regarding a *metzora*, the Torah states: *He should sit alone,* implying that no one else who is impure should be with him!?

Rather, the *Gemara* answers: There were in fact three camps in Shiloh. What does the *Baraisa* mean when it says that there were only two camps? This was regarding the camp of the Levites providing refuge for people who killed inadvertently (*that if fled to that city, the victim's avenger -- go'el ha'dam -- could not kill him*).

The *Gemara* asks: This indicates that in the Wilderness, the Camp of the Levites provided refuge for these inadvertent killers. Is this correct?

The *Gemara* answers: Yes, it is correct. This as the *Baraisa* states: *And I will give you* – a place in your lifetime. *A place* – your place. *That he will run there* – this teaches that inadvertent killers went into exile in the Wilderness. Where were they exiled to? They must have went to the Camp of the Levites. This is the source for the statement that if a Levite kills inadvertently, he is exiled from city to city (*of refuge*). If he is exiled within his city (*where he lives, going from one neighborhood to the other*), his city protects him.

The *Gemara* asks: Where is this alluded to in the Torah?

Rav Acha the son of Rav Ika says: The verse states: *for in his city of refuge he should dwell*. This indicates that it is even if it is a city where he has been living. [*Rashi indicates that this is as long as he changes neighborhoods*.] (116b3 – 117a1)

Private Altars

The *Mishnah* discusses when the Mishkan came to Gilgal.

The *Baraisa* states: Whatever is pledged and donated can be brought on a private altar, while whatever is not pledged and donated cannot be brought on a private altar. A flour offering and sacrifices for a *nazir* can be offered on a private altar; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. The *Chachamim* say: An individual only brought *olos* and *shelamim*. Rabbi Yehudah says: Whatever offerings the public and individuals offered in the Tent of Meeting in the Wilderness was also offered in the Tent of Meeting in Gilgal. What was the difference between the

Wilderness and Gilgal? Private altars were not permitted in the Wilderness, while they were permitted in Gilgal. On the private altar on one's roof, he would only offer *olos* and *shelamim*. The *Chachamim* say: Whatever offerings the public brought to the Tent of Meeting in the Wilderness could also be offered by them in the Tent of Meeting in Gilgal. An individual only brought *olos* and *shelamim*. Rabbi Shimon says: Even the public only brought *pesach* offerings and sacrifices that must be brought at a specific time (*as opposed to sacrifices such as the communal-error bull, see Rashi*).

The *Gemara* asks: What is Rabbi Meir's reasoning?

The *Gemara* answers: The verse states: *Do not do like everything we are doing today.* Moshe said to *Bnei Yisroel*: When you enter the Land, bring donations and pledges, but not obligatory sacrifices. Flour offerings and sacrifices of a *nazir* are donated and pledged (*and therefore included*).

The *Gemara* asks: What do the *Chachamim* answer to this claim?

The *Gemara* answers: There were no flour offerings on a private altar, and sacrifices of a *nazir* are obligatory. [*Rashi explains that the Gemara later quotes a derivation from the words (animal) sacrifices that flour offerings are not brought on a private altar. Additionally, nezirus sacrifices are not donated, but rather the obligatory result of one who pledges to be a nazir.*] (117a2 – 117b1)

Shmuel says: They argue regarding a *chatas* and *asham* of a *nazir*. However, everyone agrees that donated *olos* and *shelamim* of a *nazir* are brought.

Rabbah asked a question from a *Baraisa*. The *Baraisa* states: Giving the chest and right thigh to the *Kohen* and donating breads of a *todah* sacrifice apply on a major *bamah* (*that is not in the Mishkan or Beis Hamikdash*), but does not apply to a private altar. The *Baraisa* does not mention the foreleg of the animal, which is also given to the *Kohen* from the sacrifice of a *nazir*. If you say that the argument is also including the *olos* and *shelamim* of a *nazir* this is understandable, as this *Baraisa* can be according to the *Chachamim* (*which is why the foreleg is not mentioned*). However, if you say that they only argue regarding the *chatas* and *asham* of a *nazir*, who is the author of this *Baraisa*?

Rather, it must be that Shmuel states: Their argument is regarding the *olos* and *shelamim* of a *nazir*. However, everyone agrees that the *chatas* and *asham* is not offered, as it is considered obligatory. (117b1 – 117b2)

The *Chachamim* stated in the *Baraisa*: Whatever offerings the public brought to the Tent of Meeting in the Wilderness could also be offered by them in the Tent of Meeting in Gilgal. [*An individual only brought olos and shelamim.*]

The *Gemara* asks: What is the reasoning of the Chachamim

The *Gemara* answers: The verse states: *A man, what is just in his eyes he will do.* This indicates that what is fitting in his eyes (*i.e. sacrifices he donates or pledges*) are brought on a private altar, not obligatory sacrifices. The public can even bring obligatory sacrifices.

Rabbi Yehudah will say that this means that a person may build a private *bamah* wherever he wishes, but regarding a major *bamah*, even obligatory offerings can be offered for an individual. (117b2 – 118a1)

DAILY MASHAL

The Deterioration of the Generations

Rabbi Zalman Sorotzkin would say with a sigh: See the difference between previous and later generations. In those generations, when they said "each person does as he deems fit", they meant offering sacrifices to Hashem wherever desired. But in our generations, when we say, "each person does as he deems fit", people mean thievery, murder and idolatry, may Hashem have mercy (*Oznayim LaTorah*).