



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Zevachim, Daf לט – Daf טז

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

-----Daf לט--83-----

NICHNAS L'CHAPER

- A Braisa says, **R' Eliezer** says we have a gezeira shava on the words "l'chaper bakodesh" from the Kohen Gadol entering the Heichal on Yom Kippur. Just as the pasuk there teaches that noone may be in the Heichal even if the Kohen Gadol has not yet offered the ketores, so too here the pasuk means it is passul even if it was not yet offered. **R' Shimon** says, we learn a gezeira shava on the word "l'chaper" from the korbon of Yom Kippur – just as that refers to the korbon when it is offered, so too by us the pasuk teaches that it only becomes passul when it is offered.
 - The machlokes is that **R' Eliezer** holds we learn something that is done outside the Kodosh HaKodashim from something else done outside, and not from the korbon of Yom Kippur which is brought inside. **R' Shimon** holds that we would rather learn the halacha of an animal from that of another animal, rather than to learn the halacha of an animal from the halacha of a person.

R' YEHUDA OMER...

- This suggests that he holds that if it is brought in b'meidid the blood becomes passul.
 - **Q:** Would this be only if he actually offered it or even if he only intended to offer it? **A:** **R' Yirmiya** said, there is a machlokes in a Braisa between **R' Yehuda** and **R' Meir** as to what words are used for a gezeira shava to teach that the one who burns the korbanos that must be burned makes his clothing tamei. **R' Yehuda** learns this from a gezeira shava on the word "chata" and **R' Meir** learns it from a gezeira shava on the word "l'chaper". Now, what does **R' Yehuda** do with those words "l'chaper"? It must be that he uses it like **R' Shimon**, to teach that the blood only becomes passul when it is actually offered inside, not when it is only intended to be offered inside the Heichal.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL HAZEVA'CHIM SHENISARVU!!!

PEREK HAMIZBE'ACH MIKADEISH -- PEREK TESI'I

MISHNA

- The Mizbe'ach makes kadosh that which is fit for it (even if the item was passul).
 - **R' Yehoshua** said, this means that anything that is fit for the *fire* of the Mizbe'ach, if it was brought up onto the Mizbe'ach it is not taken down. This is learned from the pasuk of "hee ha'olah ahl mokdah" – just as an olah that is fit to be on the *fire* of the Mizbe'ach, if it is brought up it is not taken down, so too anything that is fit for the *fire* of the Mizbe'ach, if it is brought up it is not taken down. **R' Gamliel** said, this means that anything that is fit for the Mizbe'ach (any part of the Mizbe'ach), if it was brought up onto the Mizbe'ach it is not taken down. This is learned from the pasuk of "hee ha'olah ahl mokdah ahl haMizbe'ach" – just as an olah that is fit to be on the Mizbe'ach, if it is brought up it is not taken down, so too anything that is fit for the Mizbe'ach, if it is brought up it is not taken down.
 - The only difference between them is regarding the blood and nesachim of a korbon – according to **R' Gamliel** once they are brought up they are not taken down, and according to **R' Yehoshua** they would be taken down (since they are not placed on the *fire* of the Mizbe'ach).
 - **R' Shimon** said, if the korbon is valid and its nesachim are passul, or visa-versa, or even if both became passul, and they were brought up onto the Mizbe'ach, the korbon would not be taken down but the nesachim would be.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The Mishna suggests that the Mizbe'ach makes kadosh an item that is fit for it, but not something that is not. What does this come to exclude? **A: R' Pappa** said, it excludes a kemitza that was not made kadosh in a keili.
 - **Q: Ravina** asked, why would the kemitza be different than the case of **Ulla**, who said that the eimurim of kodshei kalim that were brought up onto the Mizbe'ach before the blood was offered, are not taken down, because they have become "the bread of the Mizbe'ach". Why is the kemitza different? **A:** The difference is that the eimurim are not lacking anything that needs to be done to them, whereas the kemitza is.

R' YEHOShUA OMER KOL HARA'UY LA'ISHIM...

- **Q:** According to **R' Gamliel** also, the pasuk says "olah ahl mokda"! **A:** That teaches that pieces that popped out of the fire must be put back into the fire.
 - **Q:** How does **R' Yehoshua** learn this? **A:** From the pasuk of "asher tochal ha'aish". **R' Gamliel** says this teaches that only parts of an olah that popped off are put back, but parts of the ketores that popped off are not put back. **R' Yehoshua** says, if it teaches that only an olah and not the ketores is returned to the fire, it thereby also teaches that an olah is returned to the fire, so both things can be learned from this pasuk.

R' GAMLIEL OMER KOL HARA'UY...

- **Q:** According to **R' Yehoshua** also, the pasuk says "Mizbe'ach"! **A:** That is giving the reason that the Torah says that even a passul item should remain on the Mizbe'ach – because anything fit for the fire is made kadosh by the Mizbe'ach. **R' Gamliel** says, another pasuk says "Mizbe'ach", and we learn from there. **R' Yehoshua** says, one mention is needed for a korbon which had a period of validity, and one is needed for a korbon that did not have a period of validity. **R' Gamliel** says, that since passul things are said to be left on the Mizbe'ach, there is no reason to think that there is a difference between something that had a period of validity and something that did not.

R' SHIMON OMER HAZEVACh KASHER...

- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon** says, the word "olah" in the pasuk teaches that just as an olah is brought on its own account and remains on the Mizbe'ach once it is brought up, so too all korbanos that come on their own account remain there once they are brought up. This excludes nesachim that are brought on account of the korbanos for which they are brought.
- A Braisa says, **R' Yose Haglili** says, the pasuk says "kol hanogeya baMizbe'ach yikdash", which suggests that the Mizbe'ach makes kadosh anything that is put on it – whether it is fit to be put on it or not. The pasuk therefore then says "kevasim", which teaches that just as lambs are fit for the Mizbe'ach, so too only things fit for it are made kadosh. **R' Akiva** says, the pasuk says "olah", which teaches that just as an olah is fit for the Mizbe'ach, so too only things fit for it are made kadosh.
 - **Q:** What is the difference between them? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** said, a passul olah bird would be the difference. According to **R' Akiva** it would remain on the Mizbe'ach (it too is an olah), and according to **R' Yose Haglili** it would not (because the bird is not an animal).
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yose** the pasuk also says olah!? **A:** If it would only say "kevasim" we would say that even live animals should not be taken down. The word "olah" teaches that a live animal would be taken down.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Akiva** the pasuk also says kevasim!? **A:** If it would only say "olah" we would say that even a passul mincha should not be taken down. The word "kevasim" teaches this only applies to living beings.
 - **Q:** What is the difference between these Tanna'in and the Tanna'im in our Mishna? **A: R' Pappa** said, the difference would be regarding a kemitza that was made kadosh in a keili and then became passul. According to the Tanna'im of our Mishna it would not be taken down, but according to these Tanna'im of the Braisa it would be taken down.
- **Reish Lakish** said:
 - With regard to a mincha that is brought on its own (that became passul and was brought up onto the Mizbe'ach), according to the Tanna'im of our Mishna it would not be taken down and according to **R' Yose and R' Akiva** it would be taken down.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- With regard to a mincha that is brought on account of an animal korbon, according to **R' Gamliel and R' Yehoshua** it would not be taken down, and according to all the others it would be taken down.
- With regard to nesachim that are brought on its own, according to **R' Gamliel and R' Shimon** it would not be brought down, and according to all the others it would be taken down.
- With regard to nesachim that are brought on account of an animal korbon, according to **R' Gamliel** it is not taken down, and according to all the others it would be taken down.
- **Q:** What is the chiddush of **Reish Lakish**? This all seems obvious!? **A:** He was teaching us the shita of **Rava**, that a person may bring a minchas nesachim as a nedavah.
 - **Q:** Why didn't he simply state **Rava's** rule, instead of arriving at it in this somewhat backward way? **A:** Rather, his chiddush is regarding nesachim that are brought on account of an animal korbon, but that were not brought at the same time as the animal, as we have learned that such nesachim may be brought at a later date. We would think that they are treated like nesachim brought on their own account (since they are not being brought with the korbon) and therefore **R' Shimon** would agree that they are not taken down. **Reish Lakish** therefore teaches that they are considered as nesachim brought on account of a korbon and **R' Shimon** would therefore hold that they are taken down.

-----Daf 75-----84-----

MISHNA

- The following are not taken down once they have been brought up onto the Mizbe'ach: something which was left overnight, something that was taken out of the Azarah after the shechita, something which became tamei, something that was shechted with an intent for beyond its time or beyond its place, and something whose kabbalah and zrika were done by people who are passul to do so. **R' Yehuda** says that a korbon that was shechted at night, or whose blood spilled, or whose blood went beyond the curtains, even if they were brought up onto the Mizbe'ach, they are taken down. **R' Shimon** said these are not taken down, because **R' Shimon** says, any korbon whose psul is in the kodesh (it was valid when brought into the Azarah and then became passul), Hashem accepts it. If its psul was not in the kodesh, Hashem does not accept it.
 - The following do not have their "psul in the kodesh": an animal that sodomized a person or that was sodomized by a man, an animal that was designated for use by avoda zara, one that was worshipped as an avoda zara, an animal used to pay a zonah, one that was exchanged for a dog, an animal of kilayim (mixed breed), a treifah, an animal born by Caesarean section, and one that was a baal mum. **R' Akiva** says that a baal mum would not be taken down. **R' Chanina Sgan HaKohanim** said, my father would push the animal with the mum off the Mizbe'ach.
- Just as the halacha is that once they went up they are not taken down, so too the halacha is that once they are taken down they are not brought back up. If any of them went up while they were still alive, they are taken down.
 - If an olah is brought up when it was alive, it should be taken down. If it was shechted up there, it should be skinned and cut into pieces in its place.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** says, the words in the pasuk "zos", "hee", and "ha'olah" are 3 exclusionary terms, which come to exclude the cases of a korbon shechted at night, or whose blood spilled, or whose blood went beyond the curtains, and to teach that they are taken down even if they were brought up. **R' Shimon** says, the word "olah" would suggest that only a valid olah (or other korbon) remains on the Mizbe'ach. How do we know to also include the cases of a korbon shechted at night, or whose blood spilled, or whose blood went beyond the curtains, or which was left overnight, or that was taken out of the Azarah after the shechita, or which became tamei, or that was shechted with an intent for beyond its time or beyond its place, or whose kabbalah and zrika were done by people who are passul to do so, or whose blood should have been applied below but was applied above the red line, or visa-versa, or whose blood should have been applied outside the Heichal but was applied inside, or visa-versa, or a Pesach or chatas that was shechted not lishma, that all these are also not taken down if they were brought up? The pasuk therefore says "toras ha'olah", to teach that there is one general rule for all

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

things that were brought up – the rule is that they are not taken down. I would think to include even an animal that sodomized a person, or that was sodomized by a man, an animal that was designated for use by avoda zara, one that was worshipped as an avoda zara, an animal used to pay a zonah, one that was exchanged for a dog, an animal of kilayim (mixed breed), a treifah, and an animal born by Caesarean section. The Torah therefore writes “zos”, to exclude these cases. Why do we include the first list and exclude this second list? We include any korbon whose psul is in the kodesh and exclude any korbon whose psul is not in the kodesh.

- **R' Yehuda's** reasoning is based on a Braisa. The Braisa says that if blood of a korbon is kept past sundown it is still considered to be valid in the sense that if it is brought up onto the Mizbe'ach it would not be taken down. We learn this from a binyan av from eimurim of a korbon that are left past sundown, that they remain valid in the sense that if they are brought up onto the Mizbe'ach they would not be taken down. We learn that this is true for eimurim from a binyan av from the meat of a korbon (shelamim) that does not become passul when left overnight.
 - **Q:** Can we learn something that is passul from something that is valid (the meat of the shelamim)!? **A:** The Tanna of the Braisa is relying on the exclusionary terms of “zos toras ha'olah”. He uses the comparisons to teach which items are those that are to be excluded.
- **R' Yochanan** said, if one shechted an animal at night inside the Azarah and then offered it outside the Azarah, he would be chayuv for offering a korbon outside of the Azarah. There is no reason to say that this should be any less severe than one who shechted it outside and offered it outside.
 - **Q: R' Chiya bar Avin** asked, a Mishna says, if a person shechted a bird inside the Azarah and then offered it outside the Azarah he is patur. If he shechted it outside and offered it outside he is chayuv. Now, why don't we say that the first case should not be any less severe than the second!? **A: TEYUFTA** of **R' Yochanan**. **A2:** The shechita of a bird inside the Azarah is considered like a simple killing of the bird – it doesn't even have the status of shechita (since a bird is only supposed to be killed with melika inside the Azarah). That is why he would be patur if he then offered it outside the Azarah.

-----Daf 75-----85-----

- **Ulla** said, if eimurim of kodshei kalim were brought up onto the Mizbe'ach before their blood was offered, they are not taken down, because they have become the “bread” of the Mizbe'ach.
 - **R' Zeira** said, we have learned this as well in the Braisa quoted above, which said that a korbon whose blood spilled or whose blood was taken outside of the curtains are not taken down from the Mizbe'ach. Now, if in the those cases where the Kohen cannot offer the blood even if he wanted to, yet we have said that if the korbanos were brought up they are not taken down, then in **Ulla's** case, where if he wants to offer the blood he can, surely we should say that the eimurim do not have to be taken down.
 - The Gemara says this is no proof, because the Braisa may only be talking about kodshei kodashim, which have more kedusha, and it may be that that is why they are not taken down.
 - **Q:** The Braisa lists the Korbon Pesach, which is kodshei kalim!? **A:** That is referring only to a case where it was done not lishma
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from our Mishna. The Mishna said, that if any korbon went up onto the Mizbe'ach alive, it is brought down. This implies that if they were brought up after their shechita, even if it was before their zrika, they would not be brought down!? **A:** The Mishna means, that if they were brought up after their shechita, some of them would be brought down and some would not be brought down.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says “if any korbon...”!? **A:** That is referring to korbanos that went up while alive. That is when it applies to *all* korbanos. Although this seems obvious, we would say that it refers to live animals that have the mum of “dukin sheba'ayin”, and follows the view of **R' Akiva** who says that if an animal with such a mum was brought up, it is not taken down.
 - **Q:** The Mishna later says that if an olah was brought up alive it should be taken down to be shechted. If it was shechted up there, it should be skinned, cut into pieces, and offered up there. Now, if the Mishna is referring to korbanos with a mum, this olah would not have to be cut up!? A pasuk teaches that only a valid olah is required to be

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

cut up!? **A:** That part of the Mishna is referring to a valid korbon. Although the Mishna would then seem to be obvious, we can say that the Mishna is teaching that we would skin and cut up a valid olah that was shechted on top of the Mizbe'ach, right there on top of the Mizbe'ach.

- **Q:** According to the view that we may never skin and cut up a valid olah on top of the Mizbe'ach, we must say that the Mishna is not discussing a valid olah!? **A:** The Mishna is dealing with a passul korbon that had a period of validity, and follows the view of **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon**, who says that if the blood of a korbon was offered and its meat was valid for even a short time, it should be skinned and the skins are given to the Kohanim.
- **Q:** A Braisa on our Mishna says that after skinning and cutting up the olah he takes down the intestines and washes them. Now, if we are dealing with a passul korbon why would we take the intestines down to wash them, since by taking them down they will no longer be allowed back up!? **A:** We wash them in case another Kohen sees them, and without realizing that they are from a passul korbon decides to bring them back up.
- **R' Chiya bar Abba** said that **R' Yochanan** asked whether eimurim of kodshei kalim that were brought up onto the Mizbe'ach before their blood was offered are taken down or not. **R' Ami** asked him, why don't you ask whether they are subject to me'ilah? **R' Yochanan** said, I don't ask about me'ilah, because I know that it is the zrika that makes them subject to me'ilah. **R' Yochanan** then answered that they would not be taken down from the Mizbe'ach and they are not subject to me'ilah.
 - **Another** version of the above was that **R' Chiya bar Abba** said that **R' Yochanan** asked whether eimurim of kodshei kalim are subject to me'ilah. **R' Ami** asked why he didn't ask whether they would be taken off the Mizbe'ach. **R' Yochanan** said he didn't ask about that, because since the eimurim became the "bread" of the Mizbe'ach they would not be taken down. **R' Yochanan** then answered that they would not be taken down from the Mizbe'ach and they are not subject to me'ilah.

V'EILU LO HAYA PESULAN...

- **R' Yochanan** said, **R' Akiva** only allowed this for the type of mum like cataracts in the eye. Since such a mum does not make a bird passul it also does not require that the animal be removed from the Mizbe'ach on account of it. Also, this is only if the mum came about after the animal was made kadosh. **R' Akiva** would also agree regarding a female olah, that it is considered to be as if the mum came before it made kadosh (an olah may only be brought from the male gender).
- **Q:** **R' Yirmiya** asked, is a bird that was sodomized by a person passul? Do we say that "min habeheima" teaches to exclude an animal that sodomized and that was sodomized, and since they are taught from the same place, we would say that a bird that cannot sodomize a person does not become passul if it was sodomized by a person? Or do we say that a sin was committed with it and therefore it becomes passul? **A:** **Rabbah** said, in our Mishna **R' Akiva** allows animals with certain mumim to remain on the Mizbe'ach since they are not considered a mum for a bird. If a bird that was sodomized is still valid, he should likewise say that an animal that was sodomized can remain on top of the Mizbe'ach, and he does not say so. We see from here that a bird that was sodomized is passul.
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** brings a Braisa to prove that **Rabbah** is correct.

R' CHANINA SGAN HAKOHANIM...

- **Q:** He is simply repeating the view of the **T"K**, so what is he teaching us? **A:** Either he wanted to tell us that this was carried out in practice, or he was telling us that his father didn't directly take them down, but rather did so indirectly.

KISHEIM SHE'IHM ALU...

- **Ulla** said, this (that although they are not taken down, if they are taken down they are not brought back up) is only if the fire had not taken hold of them. However, if the fire had taken hold of them, then even if they were taken down, they are brought back up.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Mari** learned the ruling of **Ulla** on the earlier part of the Mishna (as stated above). **R' Chanina of Sura** taught it on the next Mishna which says, with regard to the bones, sinews, horns, and hooves, as long as they are attached to the korbbon they are brought up along with it, but if they were separated they are not brought up. A Braisa then says that even if they were brought up they must be taken down. Regarding that, he says that **Ulla** said, that is only if the fire had not yet taken hold of them. If it had, it is brought back up.
 - **R' Mari** may not agree with **R' Chanina**, because he may say that these are not fit for burning, and as such there is no difference whether the fire has taken hold of them.

-----Daf כ"ט---86-----

MISHNA

- The following things must be taken down from the Mizbe'ach even if they were already brought up onto it: the meat of kodshei kodashim, the meat of kodshei kalim, the leftover of the Omer (after the kemitza has been taken), the Shte Halechem (which are brought on Shavuot), the Lechem Hapanim, the leftover of menachos, and the ketores (it belongs on the inside Mizbe'ach).
 - With regard to the wool on the head of lambs, the hair of the beard of male goats, and the bones, sinews, horns, and hooves, the rule is that if they are still attached to the korbbon they are brought up onto the Mizbe'ach along with it. This is based on the pasuk of "v'hiktir haKohen es hakol". If they were separated from the korbbon they are not brought up. This is based on the pasuk of "v'asisa olosecha habasar v'hadam".

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk of "v'hiktir haKohen es *hakol* haMizbeicha" comes to include the bones, sinews, horns, and hooves. We would think that they should be offered even if they are separated from the animal. The pasuk therefore says "v'asisa olosecha habasar v'hadam". Once we have the two pesukim, we learn that while they are attached they are offered, and when they are not attached they are not offered and must even be taken off if they were brought up.
 - **Q:** Who is the Tanna of this Braisa who says that they must be taken off if they were brought up? **A:** It is **Rebbi**, as he clearly states this view in a Braisa.
 - **R' Zeira** said, when **Rebbi** says that if it is separated it must be taken down, that is when the act of separation (e.g. the cutting off of the hooves) moved them further away from the fire of the Mizbe'ach. However, if it moved it closer to the fire it is considered to have been moved closer for burning and therefore would remain there.
 - **Q:** Can we say that even when they are no longer attached there are cases when they are still left on the Mizbe'ach? **Rebbi** is very clear that it is dependent on whether they are attached or not attached!? **A:** **Rabbah** said, what **R' Zeira** meant was that these removed pieces (the bones, sinews, etc.) have kedusha only if they were removed after the zrika. However, if they were removed before the zrika, then the zrika comes and makes them mutar for benefit, even to be used to make a knife handle.
 - **Rabbah** holds like **R' Yochanan in the name of R' Yishmael**, who darshened a gezeira shava between olah and ashm to teach that just as the bones of an ashm are mutar to be used by the Kohanim, the bones of an olah are the same.
 - The words of the gezeira shava must be used for no other drasha (if they are used for another drasha, one may refute a gezeira shava, and if they are not used for another drasha, it may not be refuted), because if not, we can ask that the bones of an ashm are mutar because its meat is mutar, whereas the bones of an olah should be assur because its meat is assur.
 - **Q:** **R' Ada bar Ahava** asked, a Braisa said that the bones of kodashim are subject to me'ilah only until the zrika, but the bones of an olah are always subject to

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

me'ilah. This seems to refute **Rabbah**! **A:** We have to change the Braisa to say that with regard to the bones of an olah, if they were separated from the korbbon before the zrika they are not subject to me'ilah, but if they were separated after zrika they remain subject to me'ilah forever.

- **Rabbah** seems to argue with **R' Elazar**, who said regarding an olah, that if the bones were separated before zrika they remain subject to me'ilah forever, and if they are separated after zrika, they are assur to benefit from, but are not subject to me'ilah.

MISHNA

- If any of these things popped out of the fire (from the heat) they do not need to be returned to the Mizbe'ach. Similarly, if a coal popped off the Mizbe'ach it need not be returned to the fire. If limbs of a valid korbbon popped off the Mizbe'ach, if it happened before chatzos it should be returned and they are subject to me'ilah. If it happened after chatzos they need not be returned and they are not subject to me'ilah.
- Just as the Mizbe'ach makes kadosh things that are fit for it, the ramp of the Mizbe'ach makes kadosh as well. Just as the Mizbe'ach and the ramp make kadosh, so too the klei shareis make kadosh.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is the case that the Mishna discusses? If the limbs still have substance, they should be returned to the fire even after chatzos, and if they have no substance, they should not be returned even before chatzos!? **A:** The case is regarding limbs that have become hardened and fully burned, but which have not yet become charcoal.
- **Q:** How do we know that there is a cutoff at chatzos? **Rav** said, this is learned from the fact that a pasuk seems to suggest that the limbs may be burned all night, but also suggests that the terumas hadeshen may be done all night. We can explain this by saying that we split the night into 2 parts: before chatzos is for burning and after chatzos is for terumas hadeshen.
 - **Q: R' Kahana** asked, if this is truly based on a pasuk, how can our Mishna say that we begin terumas hadeshen before chatzos on the Yomim Tovim!? **A: R' Yochanan** said, the pasuk says the limbs may be burned "all night" and then says "until morning". The seemingly unnecessary words teach that the limbs need not be returned to the Mizbe'ach after chatzos, but terumas hadeshen may begin at any point of the night. Therefore, on a typical day there is no need to begin before actual morning. On Yom Kippur, where all must be done by the Kohen Gadol, who is fasting and weak, we may begin earlier. On Yom Tov we begin even earlier, to accommodate for all the people bringing korbanos.

-----Daf י"ז-----87-----

- We have learned, if limbs of a korbbon that were hardened from the fire popped off the Mizbe'ach before chatzos and were returned after chatzos, **Rabbah** said it is chatzos of the following night that makes them considered to be consumed (and even if they were not fully burned to charcoal, but again popped off after the following chatzos they would not have to be returned to the fire), and **R' Chisda** said it is the dawn following that first chatzos that makes them considered to be consumed.
 - In the yeshiva of **Rav** they said, the view of **R' Chisda** is based on a kal v'chomer – if chatzos, which is not a time that makes something become passul with "linah" is still a time that makes something to be considered as consumed, then dawn, which does make something passul with "linah" should surely make something be considered as consumed.
 - If the hardened limbs popped off before chatzos and were returned after dawn, **Rabbah** says the chatzos of the following night makes them to be considered as consumed, and **R' Chisda** says these limbs are never considered as consumed (they must always be returned to the fire until they become fully ash).
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, who says that chatzos only makes things to be considered as consumed when they are actually on top of the Mizbe'ach (the two points of machlokes between **Rabbah** and **R' Chisda** are

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

based on the fact that since they are not on the Mizbe'ach at chatzos, they are not considered to be consumed)? Maybe when chatzos comes they are considered to be consumed no matter where they happen to be at the time of chatzos!?

- They sent from EY that the halacha follows **R' Yosef**. We also learned that **R' Chiya bar Abba** said, if hardened limbs pop off the Mizbe'ach before chatzos and are returned after chatzos they are assur to have hana'ah from (D'Rabanan), but they are not subject to me'ilah (because they are considered to be consumed). **Bar Kappara** also taught a Braisa that says that these limbs would no longer be subject to me'ilah.
- **Q: R' Pappa** asked **Abaye**, if we have all these rulings, it must be that **Rabbah** and **R' Chisda** agree with them. If so, what is the case in which they argue? **A: Abaye** said, they argue regarding fatty limbs that popped off before chatzos and were not returned until after chatzos (even though they are hardened, their fattiness makes that they are not considered as ash and are therefore not considered to be consumed).
- **Q: Rava** asked **Rabbah**, does something that is on the top of the Mizbe'ach become passul as "linah" if it remained there overnight? [The Gemara asks, what is the case? It can't be where it was never taken down and the question is whether it must be taken down, because even something that is passul as "linah" for having been in the Azarah overnight, which is then brought on the Mizbe'ach will not be taken down, so certainly something left on the Mizbe'ach will not be taken down! Rather, the case is where it was taken down, and the question is whether it may be brought back up. The basis of the question is, do we compare the Mizbe'ach to the Shulchan, and just as the Lechem Hapanim left on the Shulchan does not become passul the same should be for things left of the Mizbe'ach, or do we say that the Mizbe'ach is compared to the floor of the Azarah, and something left there will become passul as linah.] **A: Rabbah** answered, it does not become passul as linah when it is on top of the Mizbe'ach.
 - **Q: Did Rava** accept this answer? **A: We** find that **Rava** explicitly argues with **Rabbah** and says that if the items left on the Mizbe'ach overnight were taken down, they may not be brought back up. SHEMA MINAH that he did not accept this answer of **Rabbah**.

KISHEIM SHEHAMIZBE'ACH MIKADESH...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk of "kol hanogeya baMizbe'ach yikdash" would only teach that the Mizbe'ach makes items on it kadosh. The pasuk of "es haMizbe'ach" teaches that even the ramp makes it kadosh. The pasuk of "kol hanogeya bahem yikdash" teaches that even the klei kodesh make items that touch them kodesh.
 - **Reish Lakish** asked **R' Yochanan**, do klei shareis make passul items kadosh? **R' Yochanan** said, the Mishna says that just as the Mizbe'ach makes things kadosh, so does the ramp, and so does the klei shareis! **Reish Lakish** said, you are answering with regard to it becoming kadosh to the point that it can no longer be redeemed. I mean to ask whether placing a passul korbon in a kli shareis makes it kadosh to the point that it may then be burned on the Mizbe'ach. **R' Yochanan** said, the earlier Mishna said, if a korbon's kabbalah was done by a passul person and the zrika was done by a passul person, if this korbon is then brought up onto the Mizbe'ach, it is not taken down. This suggests that if only the kabbalah was done by a passul person, but the zrika was done by a valid person it would be allowed to even be brought up onto the Mizbe'ach l'chatchila. This must be, because the kli shareis makes it kadosh to be offered on the Mizbe'ach. **Reish Lakish** said, the Mishna should be understood as referring to two separate cases – if the kabbalah was done by someone who was passul *or* the zrika was done by someone who was passul. With this reading, the fact that a passul did the kabbalah alone makes that the korbon may only be offered b'dieved, if it was brought up onto the Mizbe'ach.
 - **Q: Is the airspace of the Mizbe'ach** considered like the Mizbe'ach itself or not (does the airspace make something suspended in it kadosh)? **A: The Mishna** said that the ramp also makes things on it kadosh. Now, if the airspace of the ramp is not like the ramp, then how can anything that is passul be moved from the ramp to the Mizbe'ach? As soon as it is lifted off the ramp it will get the status as if it was taken down, and would then not be allowed to be brought up onto the Mizbe'ach! It must be that the airspace is like it itself, and the same would be for the Mizbe'ach.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- This is not a valid proof. The case may be that the Kohen dragged the korbon from the ramp up onto the Mizbe'ach.
 - **Q:** There is a space between the ramp and the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** As long as the majority of the korbon is on the ramp it is considered to be on the ramp, and when the majority makes it to the Mizbe'ach it is considered to be on the Mizbe'ach.
 - **Q:** We should be able to answer the question of **Rami bar Chama**, who asked whether if the majority of something is on the Mizbe'ach do we consider it as if the entire thing is on the Mizbe'ach. We should be able to answer from here that it is!? **A:** Indeed, we can answer this question from here.
- **Q: Rava bar R' Chanan** asked, if we say that the airspace of the Mizbe'ach is like the Mizbe'ach itself, how can a bird olah ever become passul as piggul with an intent to offer it the next day? Since the melika is done on the Mizbe'ach, if the airspace is like the Mizbe'ach it makes it that even if the bird is then left till the next day it may be offered. If so, an intent to offer it the next day should not make it passul, since it may in fact be offered the next day!? **A: R' Simi bar Ashi** said, the case could be where he does the melika with intent to take it down from the Mizbe'ach the next day and to then bring it up and offer it. In that case it would not be allowed to be offered the next day and would therefore become piggul.
 - **Q:** That only works according to **Rava**, who says that it becomes passul as linah even though it is on top of the Mizbe'ach, but according to **Rabbah** it does not, so even if it was taken down it could then be brought up, so it would not become passul as piggul!? **A:** According to **Rabbah** the case would be where he did the melika with intent to take the bird down from the Mizbe'ach before dawn and to bring it back up after dawn. In that case it would be passul to be offered, and piggul intent to do so would therefore make it passul as piggul.
 - **Q:** We can bring a proof that the airspace of the Mizbe'ach *is* like the Mizbe'ach itself, because if it is not, how can the blood of a passul chatas bird be offered? As soon as the Kohen lifts the bird it should be like it was taken down from the Mizbe'ach and therefore cannot be brought back up!? The same should be for the blood of all other passul korbanos that have made it to the top of the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** The case may be where the Kohen keeps the bird or the keili of blood in contact with the wall of the Mizbe'ach the entire time.
 - **Q:** Offering blood like that would not be a valid sprinkling as is needed for a bird chatas or a valid zrika needed for other korbanos!? Rather, it must be that the airspace is considered to be like the Mizbe'ach itself. **A: R' Ashi** said, when the Kohen is on the Mizbe'ach it is clear that anything that he is holding is considered to be on the Mizbe'ach itself. The question regarding the airspace was where a person was standing off the Mizbe'ach and hung something from a stick into the airspace of the Mizbe'ach. In that case, what is the status of the airspace? The Gemara remains with a **TEIKU**.

-----Daf פד---88-----

MISHNA

- Keilim used for liquids make liquids kadosh and measures used for solids make solids kadosh. Keilim used for liquids do not make solids kadosh, and measures used for solids do not make liquids kadosh.
- If a kli kodesh formed a hole in it, if they can still serve the function for which they were used when whole, they make items kadosh. If not, they do not.
- All of them only make things kadosh when in the Azarah.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Shmuel** said, when the Mishna said that keilim used for liquids are only mekadesh liquids, that is referring to measures used for liquids. However, the bowls used for liquids can even make solids kadosh, as the pasuk says “shneyhem milei’ihm soles”.
 - **Q: R’ Acha MiDifti** asked **Ravina**, the mincha referred to in the pasuk was moist (it was mixed with oil) and maybe that is why the bowl makes it kadosh, but maybe a true solid would not become kadosh in the bowls used for liquids!? **A: Ravina** said, the pasuk teaches that even the dry pieces in the mixture become kadosh in the bowl. We can also answer that a mincha, even when mixed with oil, is still considered to be a dry solid substance when compared to blood.
- **Shmuel** said, klei shareis only make kadosh when they are whole, they only make kadosh when they are full (have the full required measure of the korbon in them), and only make kadosh from their inside. **Another** version says that he said they only make kadosh when they are whole, full, and inside (the Azarah).
 - The difference between the versions is any amount that is above the rim of the keili. According to the first version it would not become kadosh and according to the second version it would.
 - A Braisa says that the klei kodosh make kadosh only when they are whole, full, in their inside, and when inside the Azarah.
 - **R’ Assi in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, the keili makes kodosh even when it is not full as long as the intent is to add to it to make it full. **R’ Yose** says this in a Braisa as well.

EIN KLI HALACH MEKADESH...

- **Rav or R’ Assi** said, although the keili does not make the other substance kadosh to be offered, it does make it kadosh to become passul (if it is then taken out of the Azarah, left overnight, etc.).
 - Others say that this ruling was not made in reference to our Mishna, but rather to a Braisa that discusses the bringing of nesachim, menachos, or bikkurim from a mixture of terumah or orlah or kilayim.
- A Braisa says, if klei kodosh formed a hole, it should not be melted down to be repaired, or have lead melted into it to repair it. If they became damaged, they should not be repaired. If a knife became “pagum”, it should not be repaired with filing it. If the blade came out of the handle, it should not be returned. **Abba Shaul** said, there was a knife in the Mikdash that had a tendency to make animals into treifos, and the Kohanim decided to hide it away.
- A Braisa says, the bigdei Kehuna had to be made with weaving, as the pasuk says “maasei oreig”. If they became dirty, they are not to be washed with cleaning agents (nesser or ahal). [The Gemara asks, does that mean that it may be washed with water? **Abaye** said, the Braisa means, if they only became somewhat dirty, so that even water would be enough to wash them, then they may even be cleaned with cleaning agents. However, if they became so dirty that cleaning agents are needed, then they may even not be washed in water.] **Some** say that they may not even be washed at all, because there should be no showing of poverty in the place of wealth (in the Beis Hamikdash).
- A Braisa says, the “me’il” was made entirely of techeiles, as the pasuk says “vayaas es me’il ha’eifod...klil techeiles”. On the bottom they would bring techeiles, argaman, and tolaas shani all twisted together and make the form of pomegranates from them. They then brought 72 bells and clappers and hung them on the bottom as well. There were 36 in the front and 36 in the back. **R’ Dosa in the name of R’ Yehuda** said there were only 36 – 18 in the front and 18 in the back.
 - **R’ Inyani bar Sason** said that this same machlokes in number is found in a Mishna regarding the number of different types of nega’im, where **R’ Dosa ben Horkinas** says there are 36 kinds and **Akavya ben Mahalalel** says there are 72 kinds.
 - **R’ Inyani bar Sason** also said, why is the parsha of korbanos taught next to the parsha of the bigdei kehuna? It is to teach that just as korbanos bring kapparah, the bigdei kehuna bring kapparah as well. The shirt brings kapparah for murder, the pants bring kapparah for giluy arayos, the hat brings kapparah for haughtiness, the gartel brings kapparah for improper thoughts of the heart, the choshen brings kapparah for perverted justice, the eiphod brings kapparah for avoda zara, the me’il brings kapparah for lashon harah, and the tzitz brings kapparah for chutzpah.
 - **Q: R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** said that korbanos do not bring kaparah for murder and lashon harah. Rather, kapparah for murder is brought by the eglah arufah, and kapparah for lashon harah is

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

brought by the ketores. We see that the kapparah for these aveiros are not brought about by the bigdei kehunah!? **A:** The bigdei kehunah bring kapparah for murder when we know who the murderer is.

- **Q:** If we know who he is, he must be put to death!? **A:** It is needed for one who killed b'meizid, but was not warned. In this case he is not put to death, and the tzibbur receives a kapparah from the shirt of the bigdei kehunah.
- **A:** The ketores brings kapparah for lashon harah spoken in private and the me'il brings kapparah for lashon harash spoken in public.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HAMIZBE'ACH MIKADESH!!!

-----Daf װד---89-----

PEREK KOL HATADIR -- PEREK ASIRI

MISHNA

- Anything that is more tadir (frequent) than another thing, takes precedence over that other thing.
 - The Tamid comes before the Mussaf, the Mussaf of Shabbos comes before the Mussaf of Rosh Chodesh, the Mussaf of Rosh Chodesh comes before the Mussaf of Rosh Hahshana. This is based on the pasuk of “milvad olas haboker asher l'olas hatamid taasu es eileh”.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that a tadir takes precedence?
 - **Q:** The Mishna says it is based on the pasuk!? **A:** That explains why the tamid takes precedence, because it is brought every day. How do we know that this concept even applies when deciding between which mussaf to bring first (things that are not brought every day)?
 - **A: R' Illa'ah** said, the pasuk says “ka'eileh taasu layom shivas yamim”, which teaches that “these” (the mussaf of each day of Pesach) is like “those” (the tamid and the mussaf of the first day, where the tadir took precedence).
 - **Q:** This pasuk is needed to teach that each day the of Pesach the mussaf is the same!? **A:** The pasuk could have said “eileh”.
 - **Q:** If it didn't say “ka'eileh” we would think that these 7 lambs should be divided among the seven days (rather than 7 lambs to be brought each day)!? **A:** We would not say that, because the pasuk says “layom”.
 - **Q:** We would say that “eileh layom” teaches that this amount is brought on the first day, and on the remaining days we would not know how many are brought!? **A:** The pasuk says “taasu”, which teaches that all days are to be the same.
 - **A: Abaye** said, the pasuk says “milvad olas haboker asher l'olas hatamid”. This extra phrase of “olas hatamid” teaches that something that is more frequent takes precedence.

MISHNA

- Anything that is more kadosh than another thing takes precedence over that other thing.
 - The applying of chatas blood comes before the applying of olah blood, because the chatas brings a kapparah.
 - The burning of the olah limbs comes before the burning of the chatas eimurim, because an olah is burned in its entirety on the Mizbe'ach.
 - A chatas comes before an asham, because its blood is offered on all 4 corners and on the base.
 - An asham comes before a todah and a nazir's ram, because it is kodshei kodashim.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A todah and nazir's ram come before a shelamim, because they are only eaten for one day and require that bread be brought with them.
- A shelamim comes before a bechor, because its blood is applied to all 4 corners, it requires semicha, nesachim, and tenufas chazeh v'shok.
- A bechor comes before a korbbon maaser, because it is kadosh from birth and is eaten only by Kohanim.
- A korbbon maaser comes before bird korbanos, because it requires shechita and 2 parts – its blood and its eimurim – are considered kodshei kodashim.
- Bird korbanos come before menachos, because they are korbanos that have blood.
- A chatas mincha comes before a minchas nedavah, because it is brought to bring kapparah for an aveira.
- A bird chatas comes before a bird olah with regard to its being offered and also with regard to its becoming hekdesh.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that a chatas comes before an olah for zrika, but an olah comes first for burning? **A:** A Braisa says, one pasuk says “upar sheini ben bakar tikach l'chatas”, which suggests that the chatas is to be second to the olah. Another pasuk says “va'assei es ha'echad chatas v'es ha'echad olah”, which suggests that the chatas takes precedence. This teaches that with regard to offering of blood the chatas takes precedence, because it brings a kapparah, and with regard to burning the limbs the olah comes first.
 - **Q:** It is only the first blood application of the chatas that brings the kapparah, so only that very first application should take precedence!? **A: Ravina** said, this pasuk is referring to the chatas brought by the Levi'im when they were installed into service. This chatas was actually not brought for kapparah. Yet, the pasuk teaches that since it is a chatas it takes precedence. We see that even if the application is not bringing a kapparah, it should still take precedence over an olah. **A2:** In EY they said, since he started with the applications of a chatas, he finishes them before moving on to the olah.
- **Q:** Between the zrika of a chatas and the burning of the limbs of an olah, which takes precedence? Is it the chatas, because it brings kapparah or is it the olah, because it is burned in its entirety? **A:** The Mishna said “the blood of a chatas comes before the blood of an olah”. This suggests that it only comes before the *blood* of an olah, and not before the *limbs* of an olah.
 - **Q:** The Mishna then says that the “limbs of an olah take precedence over the eimurim of a chatas”. This suggests that the limbs of an olah only take precedence over the *eimurim* of a chatas, and not over the *blood* of a chatas!? Rather, no proof can be brought from the Mishna.
- **Q:** Between the blood of an olah and the burning of the eimurim of a chatas, which takes precedence? **A:** The Mishna said “the blood of a chatas comes before the blood of an olah”. This suggests that it is only the *blood* of a chatas that comes before the blood of an olah, and not the *eimurim* of a chatas.
 - **Q:** The Mishna then says that the “limbs of an olah take precedence over the eimurim of a chatas”. This suggests that it is only the *limbs* of an olah that take precedence over the *eimurim* of a chatas, and not the *blood* of an olah!? Rather, no proof can be brought from the Mishna.
- **Q:** Between the blood of an olah and the blood of an ashm (which brings kapparah), which takes precedence? **A:** The Mishna said “the blood of a chatas comes before the blood of an olah”. This suggests that the blood of an ashm would not come before the blood of an olah.
 - This is not a valid proof. It may be that the blood of an ashm comes first. The reason the Mishna chose to speak of a chatas is that regarding the burning of an olah, had we said that it comes before an ashm, we would say that it only comes before an ashm, but not before a chatas. That is why the Mishna spoke of the chatas, but maybe not to say that the blood of an olah would come before the blood of an ashm.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from this part of the Mishna. The Mishna said, “a chatas comes before an ashm”. This suggests that it is only a chatas that comes before an ashm, but an olah would not come before an ashm, and presumably we are discussing the zrika! **A:** The Mishna is referring to the offering of the eimurim of the chatas versus the offering of the eimurim of the ashm. It must be that that is

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

what is being discussed, because the Mishna says “because the blood of the chatas...” instead of saying “because *it...*”. SHEMA MINAH.

CHATAS KODEMES...

- **Q:** An asham should come before a chatas, because it has a minimum required value!? **A:** The fact that chatas blood is placed on all 4 corners is a more important reason.

ASHAM KODEM L'TODAH...

- **Q:** The todah and nazir's ram should come before an asham, because they require the bringing of breads!? **A:** The fact that the asham is kodshei kodashim is a more important reason.

TODAH V'EIL NAZIR...

- **Q:** A shelamim should come first because it can be brought from the tzibbur as well (a todah and nazir's ram cannot)!? **A:** The fact that they are eaten for only one day is a more important reason.
- **Q:** Between a todah and a nazir's ram, which one comes first? Does a todah come first because it requires the bringing of 4 different types of breads, or does the nazir's ram come first because it has a shelamim brought along with it? **A:** A Braisa clearly says that the todah comes first because it requires the bringing of 4 different types of breads.

HASHELAMIM KODMIN L'BECHOR...

- **Q:** A bechor should come first, because it is born with its kedusha and only eaten by Kohanim!? **A:** The fact that the shelamim has all of its additional mitzvos associated with it, that makes it more important and therefore it comes first.

HABECHOR KODEM...

- **Q:** A korbon maaser should come first because it makes kadosh the animal counted before it and after it (when there was an error in the counting)!? **A:** The fact that bechor is kadosh from when it is born is more important.

MAASER KODEM L'OFOS...

- **Q:** The bird korbanos should come first because they are kodshei kodashim!? **A:** The fact that the maaser is an animal that gets shechita is more important.
- **Ravina bar Shila** said, the eimurim of kodshei kalim that left the Azarah before the zrika, become passul. We can see this from our Mishna, which says that maaser comes before bird korbanos, because it is an animal that gets shechita and its blood and eimurim are kodshei kodashim. Now, a bird has blood as well!? Rather, the reason the Mishna mentions blood and eimurim together is to teach that just as we are discussing blood before the zrika so too we are discussing eimurim before the zrika, and the Mishna refers to it as kodshei kodashim. This teaches that just as the blood becomes passul if it leaves the Azarah, the eimurim would as well.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can prove this from another place as well. We have learned with regard to meat of kodshei kalim that left the Azarah before the zrika – **R' Yochanan** says the meat is valid since it will anyway be allowed to leave after the zrika, and **Reish Lakish** says it is passul because it is not yet the time for it to leave. Now, they only seem to argue regarding the meat, but don't seem to argue regarding the eimurim. Presumably, they would both agree that the eimurim would be passul in that case! **A:** It may be that they argue regarding the eimurim as well. The reason they only discuss the meat is to teach the extent of **Reish Lakish** who says that the meat is passul even though they will eventually be allowed to leave the Azarah.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that the ruling of **Ravina bar Shila** is the subject of a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says, with regard to eimurim of kodshei kalim that left the Azarah before zrika, **R' Eliezer** says they are not subject to me'ilah even after the zrika, and one would not be chayuv on them for piggul, nossar, or tamei. **R' Akiva** says they are subject to me'ilah, and one would be chayuv for piggul, nossar and tamei. Presumably, the basis for the machlokes is a case where the eimurim were brought back in after having been taken out of the Azarah, and when they were back in the zrika was done. **R' Eliezer** says they became passul when they left and **R' Akiva** holds that they did not become passul! **A:** **R' Pappa** said, it may be that if the eimurim are brought back inside before the zrika all would agree that the zrika would be effective to make them subject to me'ilah, piggul, nossar, and tamei. The case that they argue is when they are outside during the time of the zrika. **R' Eliezer** holds that a zrika is not effective for something outside the Azarah and **R' Akiva** holds that it is.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Regarding the Shte Halechem **R' Pappa** said that all would agree that if they are outside the Azarah during the zrika, the zrika would not be effective!? **A:** That is because the Shte Halechem is not part of the animal itself. However, regarding eimurim, which come from the same animal as the blood that is being offered, there is a machlokes whether the zrika is effective for the eimurim even while they are outside the Azarah.