



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### Yuma Daf Mem Vuv

- **R' Elazar in the name of Bar Kappara** said, **R' Meir** said there is a 4<sup>th</sup> fire set up on the Mizbe'ach every day, including Shabbos, that was used to burn the leftover limbs of the Olah from the previous day.
  - **Q:** We already learned in our Mishna that **R' Meir** says that a 4<sup>th</sup> fire is set up for this purpose!? **A: R' Avin** explained, **Bar Kappara** is teaching that this fire is even set up for limbs of a passul Olah. However, this is only if the limbs had already been partially burned by the fire. If they have not, a special fire is not set up for them.
    - **Others** say, that for the limbs of a valid or passul Olah, a special fire is only set up if the limbs have already been partially burned on the Mizbe'ach.
  - **Q:** We already know that the special fire will be set up on Shabbos as well, because the Mishna said that on Yom Kippur there are 5 fires, one of which is this special fire (and if it is set up on Yom Kippur, it can be set up on Shabbos too)!? **A: R' Acha bar Yaakov** said, we would have thought that the Mishna refers specifically to where Yom Kippur is on Sunday, and the reason the special fire may be lit is because we may burn the korbos of Shabbos on Yom Kippur. However, we would think that this may not be done on Yom Kippur that falls on any other day of the week. This is why **Bar Kappara** taught that the fire may be set up on every Shabbos.
    - **Q: Rava** asked, the Mishna said that there were 4 fires lit *every day*, which presumably includes Shabbos as well!? **A:** This is a KASHYEH.
    - **Rava** and **Bar Kappara** argue on **R' Huna**, who says that the beginning part of an Olah (e.g. its shechita) "overrides" (presumably referring to Shabbos), but the end (e.g. the burning of the limbs) does not.
      - **R' Chisda** said that **R' Huna** means to say that the burning of the limbs overrides Shabbos, but does not override tumah (if the korbos is tamei it should not be burned on the Mizbe'ach). **Rabbah** said that **R' Huna** means that the burning overrides tumah, but not Shabbos.
        - **Q: Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, according to you, why do you say that "b'moado" teaches that it is even burned in tumah, but you do not use the same word to teach that it must be burned on Shabbos as well? And, according to **R' Chisda**, why does "b'moado" only teach that the burning overrides Shabbos, but not tumah? **A: Rabbah** said, I hold that the burning is likened to the shechita. Just like the shechita of the Friday Tamid never overrides Shabbos, so too the burning of its limbs will not override Shabbos. However, just like the shechita overrides tumah, its burning will also override tumah. **R' Chisda** does not hold of this comparison. Rather, he says that Shabbos is completely permitted for the Avodah of the Tamid, and therefore the limbs may be burned on Shabbos as well. With regard to tumah, which is only *overridden* but not totally permitted, we allow the shechita since that is part of the essential Avodah, but we do not allow the burning of the limbs, which is not.

- If one extinguished one of the coals that he took for the ketores or for the Menorah: **Abaye** says he is chayuv for the lav of “lo sichbeh”, and **Rava** says he is patur.
  - When this is done on top of the Mizbe’ach, all agree that he would be chayuv. The machlokes is where he extinguishes the coal off the Mizbe’ach. **Abaye** says it is still called “aish haMizbe’ach” and therefore part of the lav. **Rava** says, once it is removed from the Mizbe’ach, it is no longer considered to be “aish haMizbe’ach”.
    - **Q:** We find that **R’ Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuhah** says that one who extinguishes even off the Mizbe’ach will be chayuv. Must we say that **R’ Nachman** argues with **Rava**? **A:** **R’ Nachman** is discussing a case where the coal was removed for a purpose other than its mitzvah, and therefore the coal retains its status as “aish haMizbe’ach”. **Rava** is discussing a case where it was removed for a mitzvah purpose, and therefore loses that status.
    - **Others** say, that **Abaye** and **Rava** agree that if the coal is extinguished off the Mizbe’ach, he will be patur. The machlokes is when he extinguishes it on the Mizbe’ach: **Abaye** says it is “aish haMizbe’ach” and he is therefore chayuv. **Rava** says, since it has been removed from the fire on the Mizbe’ach, it is no longer considered to be “aish haMizbe’ach”.
      - **Q:** According to this, must we say that **R’ Nachman** argues on **Abaye** and **Rava**? **A:** **R’ Nachman** is discussing a case where the coal was removed for a purpose other than its mitzvah, and therefore the coal retains its status as “aish haMizbe’ach”. **Abaye** and **Rava** are discussing a case where it was removed for a mitzvah purpose, and therefore loses that status.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK TARAF B’KALFI!!!**