



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Zevachim, Daf 71 – Daf 80

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf 71--55-----

MISHNA

- With regard to the shelamim of the tzibbur and ashmos – the ashmos are: the asham for stealing, the asham for me'ilah, the asham for sinning with a “shifcha charufah”, the asham of a nazir, the asham of a metzora, and the asham taluy. The halachah regarding all of these is that the shechita must be done in the north, the kabbalah of the blood must be done in a kli shareis in the north, and the blood is applied with two applications that are like four. The korbanos are eaten within the curtains of the Azarah, by the male Kohanim, prepared in any manner, for a day and the following night until chatzos.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that the shelamim of the tzibbur has a north requirement? **A:** **Rabbah bar R' Nosson** taught a Braisa in front of **Rava** that said, the pasuk that discusses the shelamim of the tzibbur also discusses a chatas. This creates a hekesh and teaches that just as a chatas must be shechted in the north, the same is for the shelamim of the tzibbur.
 - **Q:** **Rava** asked him, chatas is itself learned from a hekesh from olah, so how can it then teach further through another hekesh? **A:** Rather, the source is from a Braisa taught by **R' Mari the son of R' Kahana**, which says that the pasuk of “ahl oloseichem v'ahl zivchei shalmeichem”, creates a hekesh directly from olah to the shelamim of the tzibbur and teaches that just as an olah is kodesh kodashim and must be shechted in the north, the same is true for the shelamim of the tzibbur.
 - **Q:** If so, what does the hekesh between the shelamim and the chatas come to teach? **A:** It teaches that just as a chatas is only eaten by the male Kohanim, the same is true for the shelamim of the tzibbur.
 - **Q:** **Abaye** asked, if this is a proper hekesh, then the shelamim of a nazir, which is mentioned in the same pasuk as the chatas, should also learn from the hekesh to chatas that it is to only be eaten by male Kohanim, and we know this is not true. Obviously, this must not be a proper hekesh, and if so, it shouldn't be made for the shelamim of the tzibbur either!? **A:** **Rava** said, regarding the shelamim of the nazir the pasuk says that the Kohen should take the cooked foreleg. This teaches that the rest of the animal may be eaten by the owners.
 - **Q:** We should say that the cooked foreleg should only be eaten by male Kohanim, but yet a Mishna says that it may even be eaten by the Kohen's wife and slave!? **A1:** KASHYEH. **A2:** The Torah refers to this foreleg as “kodesh”, not “kodshei kodashim”, and by referring to it only as kodesh the Torah teaches that it is not limited to only the male Kohanim.
 - **Q:** If so, for what purpose is the nazir's shelamim compared to the chatas? **A:** **Rava** said, it teaches that if the nazir shaved his head after offering any of the three korbanos that he has to bring, he is yotzeh.

MISHNA

- A korbon todah and the nazir's ram (the shelamim) are kodashim kalim. They may be shechted anywhere within the Azarah, their blood requires two applications that are like four, they may be eaten anywhere in Yerushalayim, by any person, prepared in any manner, for a day and the following night until chatzos. The portions that are separated from them for the Kohanim are treated the same as the rest of the korbon, except that they may only be eaten by Kohanim, their wives, their children, and their slaves.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says that Moshe told Aharon that the shelamim should be eaten in a tahor place. **R' Nechemya** asked, is that to suggest that the other korbanos can be eaten in a tamei place? Rather, it means it may be eaten in a place that is tahor for some respects and tamei for others. This refers to the “machaneh Yisrael” (which is the status which Yerushalayim has), which is tahor from tumas metzora (a metzora may not be there) but is tamei from tumas zav (a zav is allowed to be there).
 - **Q:** Maybe say that Moshe was referring to a place that is tahor from tumas zav and tamei from tumas meis, in which case he was saying that the shelamim may be eaten in the “machaneh Leviya” (which is the status that the Har Habayis has)!? **A: Abaye** said, the pasuk regarding the korban mincha says that “it” (“osah”) must be eaten in a holy place. This teaches that the todah, and by extension all kodashim kalim, can be eaten in a place of lesser kedusha – meaning that it can even be eaten in the “machaneh Leviya”. When the pasuk then says that the shelamim must be eaten in a tahor place, that serves to decrease by yet another level the place where kodashim kalim can be eaten, which therefore allows it to be eaten in the “machaneh Yisrael”. **Rava** said, when the pasuk says the mincha must be eaten in a kadosh place it teaches that kodashim kalim can be eaten outside all the machanos. When the pasuk then says that the shelamim must be eaten in a tahor place, that brings it back into one machaneh, and requires that it be eaten within the machaneh Yisrael.
 - **Q:** Why not say that this pasuk regarding shelamim requires it to come back into the machaneh Leviya? **A:** It only increases it by one degree, not two.
 - **Q:** If so, when the pasuk of mincha teaches to remove the kodashim kalim from the machanos, maybe it only does so from *one* machaneh, not all!? Also, the pasuk regarding kodashim kalim says “lo suchal lechol bisharecha”, which means that there is no thought to say that they could be eaten outside of Yerushalayim!? **A:** Rather, we must say like **Abaye** said.

MISHNA

- Shelamim are kodashim kalim. They may be shechted anywhere in the Azarah, their blood requires two applications that are like four, they may be eaten anywhere in Yerushalayim, by any person, prepared in any manner, for two days and one night. The portions that are separated from them for the Kohanim are treated the same as the rest of the korban, except that they may only be eaten by Kohanim, their wives, their children, and their slaves.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, one pasuk says that the shelamim is shechted “pesach Ohel Moed”, another pasuk says “lifnei Ohel Moed” and a third pasuk says again “lifnei Ohel Moed”. This teaches that all sides of the Azarah are valid for shechting kodashim kalim. With a kal v'chomer we can teach that the north is also valid for shechting kodashim kalim, because if one may shecht kodshei kodashim there, he may certainly shecht kodshei kalim there. **R' Eliezer** says, one of these pesukim is needed to teach that kodshei kalim may be shechted in the north. We would make a kal v'chomer to teach that it can't be shechted in the north – if kodshei kalim, which can be shechted anywhere and still kodshei kodashim may not be shechted in their area, then kodshei kodashim, which may only be shechted in the north may certainly not have kodshei kalim shechted in their area. The pasuk therefore says “Ohel Moed” to teach that it may be shechted anywhere in the Azarah.
 - **Q:** What is the practical machlokes? **A:** The **T”K** holds that one pasuk is needed to teach that the shelamim may only be shechted when the entrance to the Ohel Moed is open (not before that), one is needed to teach that the shechita can also be done to any of the sides of the entrance, and the third is to teach that it is passul if shechted to the “sides of the side” (the rooms off to the side). He holds that a pasuk is not needed to teach that the shechita can take place in the north. **R' Eliezer** holds that one pasuk is needed to teach that the shelamim may only be shechted when the entrance to the Ohel Moed is open (not before that), one is needed to teach that the shechita can also be done in the north, and

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

one is needed to teach that the shechita can also be done to any of the sides of the entrance. He holds that we do not need a pasuk to teach that the “sides of the side” are passul.

- **Q:** Why does one pasuk say “pesach Ohel Moed” and the other pasuk say “lifnei Ohel Moed”? **A:** This teaches the drasha of **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel**, who learns that the shelamim may only be shechted after the doors to the Ohel Moed have been opened, not when they are still locked. This drasha is said by others as well. In EY they added that a shelamim will also be passul if in the times of the Mishkan it is shechted before the Levi’im put up the Mishkan or after it had been taken down.
 - **Q:** It is obvious that if the doors are simply closed, it is the same as if they are locked. What if there is a curtain spread across the entrance? **A:** **R’ Zeira** said, it is definitely considered to be an open entrance.
 - **Q:** What if there is something with some height blocking the entrance? **A:** A Braisa seems to say that although there were obstacles 8 amos high in front of the doorways to the chambers that held the knives, they were considered to be part of the Azarah. We see that this would not make it to be considered as a closed door.
 - This is no proof. The Braisa may be referring to the height of those doorways, not to an obstruction in front of them.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that all doorways in the Beis Hamikdash were 20 amos tall, so how can you say that the doorway was only 8 amos tall!? **A:** The doorways to these small chambers were different.

-----Daf 1]---56-----

- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, a tamei person would only be chayuv for entering the Azarah while tamei if he enters the area which is 187x135 amos (the entire interior of the Azarah). Similarly, a Braisa was taught in front of **R’ Nachman** that said that the Azarah was 187x135 amos. **R’ Nachman** said, my father told me with regard to this area that the Kohanim may go and eat kodshei kodashim in this area, kodshei kalim may be shechted in this area, and one would be chayuv for entering this area when he is tamei.
 - **Q:** What is this measurement coming to exclude as *not* being part of the Azarah? It can’t be coming to exclude the windows and doors and thickness of the wall itself, because a Mishna says that these areas *would* have the kedusha of inside the walls!? It can’t be coming to exclude the chambers on the side of the Azarah, because a Mishna says that these chambers that are built in the non-kodesh but open into the kodesh *do* have the status of the Azarah!? **A:** It comes to exclude these chambers, and when the Mishna says they are kodesh it means that they are kodesh only D’Rabanan.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the pasuk of “bachatzar Ohel Moed yochluhah” comes to teach that these chambers are even valid for a Kohen to go and eat kodshei kodashim in them. This means that they are considered to be part of the Azarah even D’Oraisa!? **A:** **Rava** said, they are considered part of the Azarah D’Orasia only for eating. However, with regard to being chayuv for going in when tamei, it is only D’Rabanan.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, with regard to these chambers that open up into the Azarah, Kohanim may eat their kodshei kodashim there, one may *not* shecht kodshei kalim there, and one is chayuv for entering them when tamei. From the fact that the Braisa says he is “chayuv”, this presumably refers to a chatas, which would mean that it is considered to be part of the Azarah even D’Oraisa!? **A:** The Braisa says we may not shecht kodshei kalim there. This means the chambers are not considered to be part of the Azarah. Similarly, change the wording of the Braisa to say that he would *not* be chayuv for entering these chambers when tamei.
 - **Q:** It is understandable to say that we may not shecht there even if the Kohanim may eat kodshei kodashim there, because one is only allowed to shecht in a place in the Azarah from which he can see the entrance to the Ohel Moed. However, why would he not be chayuv for going there when tamei? **A:** The Braisa must even be talking about a place from where the entrance to the Ohel Moed can be seen, because we already know that the shechita can only take place from where the entrance of the Ohel Moed

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

can be seen. Therefore, it must be that the Braisa is teaching that even if the entrance can be seen from these chambers, still a shechita could not be done there, because it is not deemed to have the kedusha of the Azarah. For that same reason we can say that the person who goes there when tamei will not be chayuv.

- **Q:** The above suggests that eating of kodshei kodashim does not have to be in a place in the Azarah from which the entrance of the Ohel Moed can be seen. However, a Braisa says that **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** said that two doorways were put into the Chamber of the Knives to allow the entrance of the Ohel Moed to be seen from them so that it be permitted to eat kodshei kodashim there and to shecht there!? **A: Ravina** said, we must remove reference to eating of kodshei kodashim from the Braisa.
- **Q:** Moshe told Aharon to cook the meat at the entrance of the Ohel Moed and to eat it there – this shows that eating must be done in a place from which the entrance can be seen!? **A:** That korban was brought from the inauguration of the Mishkan, and we therefore cannot learn from there for other korbanos.
- **R' Yitzchak bar Avudimi** said, how do we know that blood of a korban becomes passul at sunset? It is based on the pasuk of “b'yom hakrivo es zivcho yei'acheil” which teaches that on the day that the animal is shechted its blood may be offered, not on another day.
 - **Q:** This pasuk is needed to teach that a shelamim may be eaten for 2 days and a night and is therefore not available to teach this!? **A:** We can learn his halacha from the extra word “hakrivo”.
 - **Q:** Maybe the pasuk should be understood as saying that if the blood is offered today the meat is eaten today and tomorrow, and if the blood is offered tomorrow the meat is eaten tomorrow and the next day? **A:** For that the pasuk would not have said “zivcho”. The word “zivcho” teaches that the blood may only be offered on the day that the animal is shechted.
- If during the avodos of a shelamim the one doing the avodah has a piggul intent to eat the meat on the night following the second day, **Chizkiya** says the korban is valid, because the meat does not have to be burned as nossar until daybreak on the third day, and **R' Yochanan** said it is piggul, because at the night following the second day it is already assur to be eaten. If one eats the meat of a shelamim on the night following the second day, **Chizkiya** said he is patur from bringing a chatas for eating nossar, because the meat does not have to be burned as nossar until daybreak on the third day, and **R' Yochanan** said he is chayuv, because at the night following the second day it is already assur to be eaten. There is a Braisa that says like **R' Yochanan**.
 - A Braisa says, we would think that a shelamim may be eaten on the night after the second day based on logic – just as a korban that may be eaten for one day may be eaten during the night following that one day, so too a shelamim which can be eaten for two days should be allowed to be eaten during the night that follows the second day. The pasuk therefore says “v'hanossar ahd yom” which we darshen to teach that while it is still day it may be eaten, but not once it is the night following that second day. We would think that it should be burned as nossar immediately after the end of that second day based on logic – just as a korban that may be eaten for one day and one night is burned as nossar as soon as the period for eating it has passed, so too a shelamim which can be eaten for two days should be burned as nossar as soon as the time for eating it has passed! The pasuk therefore says “bayom hashlishi ba'aish yisareif” – which we darshen to teach that “bayom” (during the daytime) it is to be burned, not during the night.

MISHNA

- The bechor, korban maaser, and korban pesach are all kodshim kalim. They may be shechted anywhere in the Azarah, their blood requires one application as long as it is done opposite the base. There are different halachos with regard to their consumption – the bechor is eaten by Kohanim and the maaser may be eaten by all people. They may both be eaten anywhere in Yerushalayim, prepared in any manner, for two days and one night. The Korban Pesach is only eaten at night, is only eaten until chatzos, is only eaten by those who have registered to be part of the group, and is only eaten roasted.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Who is the Tanna that says that the blood of a maaser and a pesach are thrown onto the Mizbe'ach like the blood of a bechor? **A:** **R' Chisda** said it is **R' Yose Haglili** in a Braisa, who learns this halacha from the fact that the pasuk regarding bechor says "damam" and "chelbam" (in the plural rather than the singular).
- **Q:** How do we know that it must be thrown opposite the base? **A:** **R' Elazar** said, we learn this from a gezeira shava from olah, and we learn olah from the pasuk of "ahl yesod mizbach ha'olah".
 - **Q:** If we are learning from olah, why don't we say that it also requires two blood applications like olah? **A:** **Abaye** said, the pasuk says "saviv" by olah and "saviv" by chatas, which is two pesukim teaching regarding multiple applications, and when we have two pesukim teaching us the same thing we don't teach it further to other places.
 - **Q:** What about according to the view that we do teach further when there are two pesukim that say the same thing? **A:** The pasuk says this regarding asham as well. This makes 3 pesukim that say the same thing, and when there are 3 pesukim, all would agree that we don't teach to other places.

-----Daf 57-----

HABECHOR NECHAL LAKOHANIM

- A Braisa says, how do we know that a bechor may be eaten for two days and a night? The pasuk makes a hekesh from bechor to the "chazeh v'shok" of a shelamim. This teaches that the bechor may be eaten for two days and a night, like a shelamim. This was actually a question that was posed to the Chachomim in "Kerem B'Yavneh". The question was, for how long may a bechor be eaten? **R' Tarfon** said, it may be eaten for two days and a night. **R' Yose Haglili** asked him how he knows that. **R' Tarfon** said, a shelamim is a kodshei kalim and a bechor is also a kodshei kalim, and therefore the bechor may be eaten as a shelamim may be eaten. **R' Yose Haglili** said, maybe instead make a different comparison – a bechor is a gift given to the Kohen and a chatas is a gift given to the Kohen, and therefore say that the bechor should only be eaten like the chatas, for a day and a night!? **R' Tarfon** said, bechor is more similar to shelamim, because they are both not brought for kapparah for a sin. **R' Yose Haglili** said, bechor is more similar to chatas and asham, because they are all given to the Kohen and cannot be brought as a neder or nedavah! **R' Akiva** then jumped in and said, the pasuk makes a hekesh from bechor to the "chazeh v'shok" of a shelamim. This teaches that the bechor may be eaten for two days and a night, like a shelamim. **R' Yose Haglili** said, the pasuk only compares it to the "chazeh v'shok" without specifying of which korban. Maybe it is comparing it to the chazeh v'shok of a Todah, which would then teach that just as a Todah is eaten for one day and a night, the same should be true for a bechor!? **R' Akiva** said, the pasuk says "ubisaram yihyeh lach" and then ends off by saying "lecha yihyeh". This extra phrase teaches that a bechor is "yours" for more than the minimum, and therefore can be eaten for two days and a night, like a shelamim. When this teaching of **R' Akiva** was repeated to **R' Yishmael** he told them to tell **R' Akiva** that his original answer was correct. The fact that the chazeh v'shok of a todah are given to the Kohen is itself learned from a hekesh from shelamim. Therefore, it cannot serve to teach through another hekesh.
 - **Q:** What would **R' Yishmael** learn from the extra phrase of "lecha yihyeh"? **A:** It teaches that a bechor with a mum, which is not brought as a korban, must still be given to the Kohen. **R' Akiva** learns this halacha from the plural use of "bisaram".
 - **Q:** What is the point of machlokes between **R' Yishmael** and **R' Akiva**? **A:** **R' Yishmael** holds that when something is learned partially via hekesh and partly not (the fact that the todah's chazeh v'shok is given to the Kohen is learned from a hekesh, but the fact that it is only eaten for a day and a night is not) it is still considered to be learned from a hekesh and therefore can't teach further via a hekesh. **R' Akiva** holds that such a situation is not considered as having been learned via a hekesh and can therefore be used to teach further via a hekesh.
 - **Q:** There is a Braisa which learns via a hekesh that the same way the Yom Kippur korbanos are sprinkled in the Kodosh Hakodashim they are again sprinkled in the Heichal towards the Paroches. Now, the sprinkling inside the Kodosh Hakodashim is itself learned partially via hekesh. According to **R' Akiva's** view this makes sense, because it may still teach further through a hekesh. However, according to **R' Yishmael's** view, how may this teach further through a

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

hekeshe? **A:** The first hekeshe compares the blood of the two animals, whereas the second hekeshe compares the two places. This is not considered to be a hekeshe followed by another hekeshe. We can also answer that the second hekeshe would still exist for things stated explicitly in the pasuk regarding the sprinkling in the Kodesh Hakodashim. Once the hekeshe may be used for that, it may be used to teach everything else as well.

- **Q:** A Braisa learns from the pasuk of “mimoshvoseichem tavi’u lechem tenufah” to make a hekeshe from the Shte Halechem to one of the types of breads brought with a Korbon Todah. There is then another hekeshe which teaches to compare from these breads of the todah to the other breads of a todah. Now, this is a case of a partial hekeshe. The Braisa makes sense according to **R’ Akiva**, but how would **R’ Yishmael** explain this Braisa? **A:** We learn the todah breads from the Shte Halechem from the extra word of “tavi’i”, not based on a hekeshe.

HAPESACH EINO NECHAL

- **Q:** Who is the Tanna who holds that a Pesach may only be eaten until chatzos? **R’ Yosef** said, it is **R’ Elazar ben Azarya**, as can be seen in a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R’ Elazar ben Azarya** says, the pasuk regarding Korbon Pesach says “balayla hazeh” and the pasuk regarding makas bechoros says “balayla hazeh”. Just like makas bechoros was done at chatzos, so too the Korbon Pesach must be eaten by chatzos. **R’ Akiva** says, another pasuk teaches that it can be eaten until the time of “chipazon” (the time the Yidden were rushed out of Mitzrayim), which is the morning. The pasuk of “balayla hazeh” teaches that the Pesach must be eaten at night, and not by day. We see from this Braisa that **R’ Elazar ben Azarya** holds that it becomes nossar at chatzos.
 - **Q:** **Abaye** asked, maybe the Mishna is not following **R’ Elazar** and limits it to chatzos as a gezeira D’Rabanan? **A:** The use of the word “elah” in the Mishna shows that the Mishna is comparing the prohibition of eating after chatzos to the other prohibitions of eating the Pesach mentioned in the Mishna. Just as those other ones are certainly D’Oraisa, this one is as well.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK EIZEHU MEKOMAN!!!

-----Daf פנ---58-----

PEREK KODSHEI KODASHIM -- PEREK SHISHI

MISHNA

- With regard to kodshei kodashim that were shechted on the Mizbe’ach, **R’ Yose** says it is as if they were shechted in the north, and **R’ Yose the son of R’ Yehuda** says, from the middle of the Mizbe’ach and south it is considered to be in the south and from the middle of the Mizbe’ach and north it is considered to be in the north.

GEMARA

- **R’ Assi in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, **R’ Yose** would say that the entire Mizbe’ach was situated in the north of the Azarah. If so, why does he say that shechting on it is “like” shechting in the north? We would have thought to say that the pasuk says the shechita should be “ahl yerech” (at the side) of the Mizbe’ach, which should exclude on the Mizbe’ach itself. He therefore teaches that shechting on the Mizbe’ach is like shechting in the north and is valid.
 - **Q:** **R’ Zeira** asked **R’ Assi**, you are suggesting (by saying that the machlokes in the Mishna is based on where the Mizbe’ach was located) that **R’ Yose the son of R’ Yehuda** holds that the Mizbe’ach was situated half in the north of the Azarah and half in the south. However, that can’t be, because you have said in the name of **R’ Yochanan** that **R’ Yose the son of R’ Yehuda** would agree that if the korbon was shechted on the ground opposite the Mizbe’ach, the shechita would be passul (which suggests that the entire Mizbe’ach was situated in the south)!? **A:** **R’ Assi** said, **R’ Yochanan** has said that **R’ Yose and R’ Yose the son of R’ Yehuda** argue in how to darshen a pasuk. The pasuk regarding the outside Mizbe’ach says “v’zavachta alav es olosecha v’es shilamecha”. **R’ Yose** darshens this to mean that the entire

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Mizbe'ach is fit for the shechita of an olah and of a shelamim. **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** darshens this to mean that half is fit even for the shechita of an olah and the other half is fit only for the shechita of a shelamim, because if the entire Mizbe'ach is fit for the shechita of an olah, why would the pasuk even need to mention that it is fit for the shechita of a shelamim!? **R' Yose** holds that if the pasuk only mentioned olah we would say that only an olah may be shechted on the Mizbe'ach, since its restriction to be shechted in the north leaves it limited space in which to do so. However, a shelamim, which can be shechted anywhere in the Azarah, may not be shechted on the Mizbe'ach. That is why the pasuk had to mention olah and mention shelamim.

- **Q: R' Acha MiDifti** said to **Ravina**, what did **R' Yochanan** mean that **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** would agree that if the korbon was shechted on the ground opposite the Mizbe'ach, the shechita would be passul? If can't refer to one who shechts on the base or on the ledge, because that is part of the Mizbe'ach!? It can't refer to where tunnels were dug under the Mizbe'ach and he shechted there, because a Braisa darshens a pasuk to teach that the Mizbe'ach must be attached to the ground, and cannot be situated above tunnels or on arches!? **A:** The case would be where they made the Mizbe'ach smaller, and a person then shechted on the area where the Mizbe'ach once stood.
- **R' Zeira** said, it is not possible that **R' Yochanan** taught that **R' Yose** holds that the entire Mizbe'ach was in the north, and yet there is no mention of this in any Mishna! He then searched and found a Mishna. The Mishna says that the fire on the Mizbe'ach from which the coals for the burning of the ketores were taken had to be 4 amos north from the southwest corner of the Mizbe'ach. Now, it must be that **R' Yose** is the Tanna of this Mishna. A Braisa says that **R' Yose** says, anything that is taken from within the Heichal to be put on the outside Mizbe'ach, for example the levonah that was taken from the Shulchan on Shabbos and burned on the outside Mizbe'ach, must be placed on that Mizbe'ach at the closest point to the entrance to the Heichal. Similarly, anything taken from the outside Mizbe'ach to be used inside the Heichal, for example the coals from the outside Mizbe'ach which were to be brought inside for burning of the ketores, must be taken from a Mizbe'ach at the closest point to the entrance of the Heichal. Now, based on this, what is **R' Yose's** view of the placement of the Mizbe'ach? It can't be that he holds that the entire Mizbe'ach was in the south, because then the closest point to the entrance of the Heichal would be 27 amos north from the southwest corner of the Mizbe'ach! Even if he holds that it would suffice to get it near the entrance of the Ulam (which was 10 amos wider than the entrance of the Heichal – 5 to the north and 5 to the south), he would still need to put the fire 22 amos from the southwest corner!? It can't be that he holds that half the Mizbe'ach was in the north and half was in the south, because to reach the point near the entrance of the Heichal he would have to put the fire 11 amos off the southwest corner!? Even if he holds that it would suffice to put it near the entrance of the Ulam, he would still need to put the fire 6 amos from the corner!? Rather, it must be that he holds that the entire Mizbe'ach was in the north of the Azarah. Therefore, the southwest corner of the Mizbe'ach was actually at the opening of the Heichal. The reason the fire had to be put 4 amos north was to allow for the amah of the base, the amah of the ledge, the amah of the horn, and an amah of space for the Kohanim to walk. Had it been moved north any more it would have no longer been at the entrance to the Heichal. We see from this Mishna that the view of **R' Yose** is as **R' Yochanan** said, that he holds that the entire Mizbe'ach was in the north of the Azarah.
- **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, this Mishna is no proof to the view of **R' Yose**, because the Mishna may follow the view of **R' Yehuda**, who says that the Mizbe'ach was placed in the middle of the Azarah, with its middle 10 amos (the Mizbe'ach was 32x32 amos) facing the entrance to the Heichal.
 - **Q:** How could the Mishna follow the view of **R' Yehuda**? According to him the fire would have to be put 11 amos north of the southwest corner in order for it to be near the opening of the Heichal!? Even if he holds that it would suffice to put it near the entrance of the Ulam, he would still need to put the fire 6 amos from the corner!? **A:** He holds that it only needs to be at the entrance of the Ulam. When the Mishna says it needs to

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

be 4 amos to the north, it means *besides* the amah needed for the base and the amah needed for the ledge. When taking those into account, the fire is to be placed 6 amos from the corner, which gets it to the entrance of the Ulam.

- **Q:** Why don't we say that the Mishna follows **R' Yose** and that he holds that the Mizbe'ach was in the center? **A:** We know that **R' Yehuda** holds the view that it is situated in the center.
- **R' Shrivya** said, the Mishna is not a proof to the view of **R' Yose**, because the Mishna may follow the view of **R' Yose Haglili**, who darshens pesukim and says that the kiyor had to be in the area between the Mizbe'ach and the Heichal, but to the south of the Mizbe'ach. The only reason he would have to say that it must be south of the Mizbe'ach would be if he holds that the entire Mizbe'ach was in the north, and he holds that the pasuk teaches that no keilim (including the kiyor) may be in the north. That is why it must be to the south.
 - The view that argues on **R' Yose Haglili** is the view of **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov**, who darshens the pasuk to teach that no keilim – including the Mizbe'ach – may be in the north of the Azarah.

-----Daf 59-----

- **Rav** said, if the Mizbe'ach becomes damaged, all the korbanos that are shechted there are passul (if they are left alive and not shechted until the Mizbe'ach is repaired, the korbon would be valid). We had a pasuk that taught this, but we forgot which pasuk it was. When **R' Kahana** went up to EY, he found **R' Shimon the son of Rebbi** saying in the name of **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose**, that it is learned from the pasuk of "v'zavachta alav es olosecha v'es shilamecha". Now, do we actually shecht *on* the Mizbe'ach ("alav")? Rather, the word "alav" is to be understood as saying "because of" – we shecht because of the Mizbe'ach. If the Mizbe'ach is complete the shechita of a korbon is valid, and if it is not complete it is not. **R' Yochanan** argues on **Rav** and says that whether the korbon was shechted while the Mizbe'ach is damaged or if they held off the shechita until after it was repaired, the korbon is passul.
 - The machlokes between **Rav** and **R' Yochanan** is that **Rav** holds that living things cannot be rejected and **R' Yochanan** holds that they can become rejected.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, all korbanos that were made kadosh before the Mizbe'ach was built, and the Mizbe'ach was then built, are passul. Now, this can't actually refer to korbanos made kadosh before the Mizbe'ach was built, because they would then be rejected at the time of their being made kadosh! It also can't refer to korbanos made kadosh before the Mizbe'ach was destroyed (before the first Beis Hamikdash was destroyed), because it would be obvious that that korbon could not be brought when the Second Beis Hamikdash was built, because at that time the animal would be too old to be a valid korbon! Rather, we must understand the Braisa as referring to a Mizbe'ach that became damaged. This shows that an animal made kadosh before it was damaged becomes passul, and refutes **Rav**!? **A:** We anyway had to amend the Braisa. We can say that the Braisa must be further amended to be referring to korbanos that were shechted before the Mizbe'ach was damaged.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Gidal in the name of Rav** said, that if the inside Mizbe'ach was taken away, we may burn the ketores in the place where the Mizbe'ach stood. We see that **Rav** holds that the physical Mizbe'ach is not essential, so how could he say that the korbanos become passul because of a damaged Mizbe'ach? **A:** It is like **Rava** said, that **R' Yehuda** would agree that blood of a korbon must be offered on the actual Mizbe'ach. So too, we would say that **Rav** would agree that blood of a korbon must be offered on the actual Mizbe'ach.
 - We see this view of **R' Yehuda** in a Braisa. The Braisa brings the pasuk that says that Shlomo made the floor of the Azarah kadosh so that they could burn the olos on the floor, because on the day of the dedication of the Beis Hamikdash the Mizbe'ach was too small to accommodate the burning of all the korbanos (they brought 142,000 korbanos that day). **R' Yehuda** understands these words as they are written (and it is regarding this that he said that he agreed that although the burning could be on the floor, the blood would have to be offered only on the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Mizbe'ach). **R' Yose** said that Shlomo would bring 1,000 korbanos on the Mizbe'ach of Moshe, and the Mizbe'ach that Shlomo built had an area for burning that was 400 times larger than that Mizbe'ach. Therefore, the pasuk means to say that Moshe's Mizbe'ach was removed from service at that time and the pasuk says the old Mizbe'ach was too small, as the reason that the new one was brought in. **R' Yehuda** says the new Mizbe'ach was not large enough for the korbanos of that day, because he holds that the Mizbe'ach of Moshe was larger than what **R' Yose** holds it was. According to **R' Yehuda** the new Mizbe'ach was only 11 times larger. Therefore, the floor of the Azarah had to be made kadosh to accommodate. **R' Yehuda** learns that Moshe's Mizbe'ach was larger based on a gezeira shava on the word "ravu'ah" from the Mizbe'ach of Yechezkel.

- **R' Yose** uses darshens this word to teach a gezeira shava to the inside Mizbe'ach, to teach that the outside Mizbe'ach was actually 10 amos tall, rather than 3 amos tall as stated in the pasuk. **R' Yehuda** said, it can't be that it was 10 amos tall, because the curtains around the Azarah were only 5 amos tall, which would mean that according to you (**R' Yose**) when the Kohen was on the Mizbe'ach he was visible to all!? **R' Yose** said that the curtains were actually 15 amos tall, as suggested by another pasuk. When the pasuk says that the curtains were 5 amos tall, it means they were 5 amos *taller than the Mizbe'ach*! Also, when the pasuk says that the Mizbe'ach was 3 amos tall, it means it was 3 amos tall from the point of the ledge.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yehuda** the Kohen could be seen when he did the Avodah, because the curtains were only 2 amos higher than where he was standing, so if he was taller than 2 amos he could be seen from the outside!? **A:** He could be seen, but the Avodah he was doing could not be seen, and that is sufficient.

-----Daf 60-----

- The Gemara continues with the machlokes between **R' Yehuda** and **R' Yose**.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yehuda** the pasuk makes sense when it says that Shlomo was "mekadesh" the floor, because he had to do so to allow the korbanos to be burned on it. However, according to **R' Yose** why did he have to be "mekadesh" it? **A:** He had to make it kadosh so that the new, larger Mizbe'ach could be placed there.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yose** it makes sense when the pasuk says that the "copper Mizbe'ach" was too small, since it was only the Mizbe'ach of Moshe that was too small. However, according to **R' Yehuda** it was not only the copper Mizbe'ach that was too small – rather the stone Mizbe'ach of Shlomo was also too small!? **A:** The stone Mizbe'ach replaced the copper Mizbe'ach of Moshe and was therefore referred to as the copper Mizbe'ach, and the pasuk therefore means that this stone Mizbe'ach was too small for all the korbanos.
 - **Q:** What is the basis of the machlokes (**R' Yehuda** darshens the gezeira shava from the Mizbe'ach of Yechezkel and **R' Yose** darshens it from the inner Mizbe'ach)? **A:** **R' Yehuda** holds that we learn something outside the Heichal from another thing outside the Heichal. **R' Yose** holds that we learn a keili from another keili and we don't learn a keili from a fixed structure.
 - **Rava** said, **R' Yehuda** would agree that the blood of the korbanos could not be sprinkled on the floor and would have to be offered on the Mizbe'ach itself. We see this from a Braisa that says that **R' Yehuda** holds that on Erev Pesach they would take a cup-full of blood from the floor and throw it onto the Mizbe'ach, so that if the blood of a korban spilled entirely onto the floor, this offering of the mixed bloods would make that korban valid. Now, if the floor was valid for offering blood as well, there would be no reason to do this.
 - **Q:** Maybe he holds that the floor is valid for offering blood, but he holds that it must be thrown there by the Kohen deliberately for that purpose, and that is why it is not valid until it is later thrown on the Mizbe'ach (because it wasn't thrown onto the floor with that purpose)!? **A:** If that is true, the Kohen should take the cup-full of blood and just spill it back onto the floor.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** It may be that it was thrown onto the Mizbe'ach, because that is the *best* way to do the mitzvah, but in truth it would be valid even if thrown onto the floor.
- **R' Elazar** said, one may not eat the leftover of a mincha when the Mizbe'ach is damaged. This is based on the pasuk of "v'ichluha matzos eitzel haMizbe'ach", which can't mean that the mincha must be eaten next to the Mizbe'ach, because that is not true. Rather, it means that the mincha may only be eaten when the Mizbe'ach is undamaged.
 - **Q:** How do we know that this applies to other kodshei kodashim as well? **A:** There is a gezeira shava between a mincha and other kodshei kodashim.
 - **Q:** How do we know that this applies to kodshei kalim as well? **A:** **Abaye** said, we learn this from the drasha of **R' Yose in the name of R' Yishmael** in a Braisa, who says, we would think that even after the Churban a person can bring maaser sheini to Yerushalayim and eat it there. We can ask, that maaser sheini must be brought Yerushalayim just as there is a requirement to bring a bechor to Yerushalayim, and therefore just as a bechor is only brought when there is a Beis Hamikdash, the same should be true for maaser! However, we would say that bechor is different, because it must be offered on the Mizbe'ach. We would then say that bikkurim shows that this logic is not true, because it is not offered on the Mizbe'ach and yet it is only brought when there is a Beis Hamikdash. He says that that is also not sound logic, because bikkurim is different than maser, because bikkurim must at least be placed onto the Mizbe'ach, but maaser does not have this requirement and therefore it could be thought to bring it to Yerushalayim even when there is no Beis Hamikdash. To prevent us from saying that, the pasuk makes a hekesh from maaser to bechor, which teaches that just as bechor is only brought when there is a Beis Hamikdash, the same is true for maaser sheini.
 - **Q:** Why didn't **R' Yishmael** try and learn maaser from a mah hatzad of bechor and bikkurim? **A:** It is refuted by saying that the two of them require some use of the Mizbe'ach, which is why they are not brought if there is no Beis Hamikdash, but maaser does not require the Mizbe'ach, and therefore we would think that it may be brought even after the Churban.
 - **Q:** If **R' Yishmael** holds that the kedusha of Yerushalayim remains forever ("kidsha l'shata v'kidsha l'asid lavo") then he should hold that even a bechor could be eaten there today, and if he holds that Yerushalayim no longer has its kedusha then he should even ask the question whether a bechor that was offered before the Churban could have been eaten in Yerushalayim after the Churban, instead of only focusing his question on maaser sheini!? **A:** **Ravina** said, he holds that Yerushalayim no longer has its kedusha, and in the case of the bechor which was offered when there was a Beis Hamikdash but not yet eaten before the Churban, he says that it may not be eaten because we make a hekesh from its blood to its meat – just as the blood may only be offered when there is a Mizbe'ach, the meat may only be eaten when there is a Mizbe'ach. He then makes another hekesh from bechor to maaser, to teach that maaser too, may only be eaten when there is a Beis Hamikdash. We see that a bechor, and by extension all kodshei kalim, cannot be eaten without the presence of a valid Mizbe'ach.
 - **Q:** How can something that itself was learned through a hekesh now be used to teach something else through another hekesh? **A:** This type of learning is only not done regarding kodashim. Maaser sheini is considered to be chulin, and may therefore be learned through this type of hekesh as well.
 - **Q:** That is fine according to the view that we look at the final thing that is being derived to see if it is chulin or kodesh, to decide if we can make this hekesh. However, according to the view that we look at the thing that is teaching, how can we learn this double hekesh? **A:** The blood and meat of a bechor are considered one thing, and the hekesh between them is therefore not looked at as a hekesh for determining whether a double hekesh is being used.
 - **Ravin** repeated this answer of **Abaye** to **R' Yirmiya**. **R' Yirmiya** said this is wrong. We have two Braisos. One says that when the Mishkan was taken down and the Mizbe'ach was moved the kodashim that were still in existence became passul, and the other says that the kodashim can

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

be eaten in “2 places”, which suggests that kodashim could continue to be eaten after the Mishkan was taken down. Presumably, we would answer this contradiction by saying it is kodshei kodashim that become passul and kodshei kalim that remain valid. This shows that kodshei kalim do not become passul just because the Mizbe’ach is no longer in a valid state!

- **Ravina** said, it may be that both Braisos are referring to kodshei kalim. The first Braisa follows the view of **R’ Yishmael** and the second Braisa follows the view of the **Rabanan** who argue on **R’ Yishmael**.
- The Gemara says, we can also answer that both Braisos are talking about kodshei kodashim. When the second Braisa refers to “2 places” it refers to 1) while the Mishkan is still up, and 2) after the Levi’im took down the Mishkan but before they moved the Mizbe’ach. We would have thought that once the curtains of the Azarah are taken down the korbon becomes passul as a korbon that has left the Azarah. The Braisa therefore teaches that it remains valid.
 - **Q:** Maybe say that the korbon does become passul when the curtains are taken down!? **A:** The pasuk says “v’nasah Ohel Moed”, which teaches that even as it is travelling it is still called the “Ohel Moed”.

-----Daf נד---61-----

- **R’ Huna in the name of Rav** said, the Mizbe’ach in Shiloh was made of stone. A Braisa says this as well. The Braisa says that **R’ Eliezer ben Yaakov** says that there are 3 pesukim that refer to the Mizbe’ach as being made of stone. One refers to the Mizbe’ach of Shiloh, one to the Mizbe’ach of Nov and Givon, and one to the Mizbe’ach of the Beis Hamikdash.
 - **Q: R’ Achdivoy bar Ami** asked, a Braisa says that the fire came down from Heaven onto Moshe’s Mizbe’ach, and it remained there until Shlomo built the Mizbe’ach for the Beis Hamikdash, at which time it left and a new fire came down from Heaven. That new fire remained until it left in the times of King Menasheh. Now, if **R’ Huna** is correct, the fire from Moshe’s Mizbe’ach left many years before the Beis Hamikdash was built!? **A: R’ Huna** will hold like **R’ Nosson** in another Braisa, who said that the Mizbe’ach in Shiloh was not the Mizbe’ach of Moshe. **A2: R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, when the Braisa says the fire did not leave the Mizbe’ach of Moshe, it means it did not entirely leave it, although there was a new Mizbe’ach that was used. The **Rabanan** explain that sparks from the fire on Moshe’s Mizbe’ach would go and light a fire on the Mizbe’ach of Shiloh, and **R’ Pappa** says that the fire would move around – sometimes it was on the Mizbe’ach of Moshe and sometimes on the Mizbe’ach of Shiloh.
- A Mishna says that when the people left Bavel to return to EY they increased the size of the Mizbe’ach by adding 4 amos on the south and 4 amos on the west.
 - **R’ Yosef** explained that this was done because the old size was not large enough to handle all of the korbanos of the Yidden at that time.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, the pesukim tell us that there were many more Yidden there during the First Beis Hamikdash than during the Second Beis Hamikdash, so why did they need a larger Mizbe’ach? **A: R’ Yosef** said, the First Beis Hamikdash had the help of the Heavenly fire, which consumed the korbanos quickly. It did not do so during the Second Beis Hamikdash. **A2: Ravin in the name of R’ Shimon ben Pazi in the name of Bar Kappara** said, the reason they expanded the Mizbe’ach was to create a system for the wine and water poured onto the Mizbe’ach to flow through into the areas known as the “shisin”. During the First Beis Hamikdash they thought that the pasuk’s requirement that it be a “Mizbach adamah” requires that it be completely filled with earth, thus not allowing a system to allow liquid to flow within it. In the Second Beis Hamikdash they said that the “eating” of korbanos (the burning) and the “drinking” (the pouring of the wine and water) must be the same in that they must both take place through the Mizbe’ach.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Therefore, these shisin were required. They said that “mizbach adamah” just means that the Mizbe’ach must be attached to the ground, and not built on top of arches or tunnels.

- **R’ Yosef** said, the reason the Mizbe’ach was expanded at that time was because the Anshei Kneses Hagedola, who were around at that time, knew the exact measurement that the Mizbe’ach was supposed to be. Shlomo did not, and therefore made it smaller than it was supposed to be.
 - **Q:** The pasuk tells us that Dovid told Shlomo all the specifications of the building and the keilim, which were told to him by Hashem. How can we say that they did not know the true measurements? **A:** Rather, **R’ Yosef** said, a pasuk creates a hekesh between the Beis Hamikdash and the Mizbe’ach, which teaches that just like the Beis Hamikdash was 60 amos long, the Mizbe’ach could be made up to that length as well. Therefore, they decided to expand it for their needs at that time, since they had the ability to do so.