



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Zevachim, Daf א"ק – Daf ז"ק

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 א"ק---111-----

- A Braisa says, if one pours 3 lugin of wine outside, he is chayuv. **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** says, this is only if he first made it kadosh in a kli shareis.
 - **Q:** What is the practical difference between these views? **A:** **R' Ada bar R' Yitzchak** said, it is the overflowing wine of a kli shareis – according to the **T"K** one would be chayuv for pouring that wine, and according to **R' Elazar** he would not (it is not *in* the kli shareis). **Rava the son of Rabbah** said, they argue on whether nesachim were brought on private bamos. In arguing about this, they are arguing in the same machlokes between **Rebbi and the Rabanan** in a Braisa, where **Rebbi** said that nesachim are not brought on a private bamah and the **Rabanan** say that they are. This machlokes is like the machlokes between **R' Yishmael and R' Akiva** in a Braisa based on a drasha of pesukim, where **R' Yishmael** says that nesachim are not brought on a private bamah and **R' Akiva** says that they are.

R' NECHEMYA OMER SHEYAREI HADAM...

- **R' Yochanan** said, the ruling of **R' Nechemya** follows the view that the pouring of the leftover blood on the base of the Mizbe'ach is essential to the validity of the korbon (which is why he holds that if this leftover blood is offered outside the person would be chayuv).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Nechemya** says one is chayuv for offering the leftover blood outside. **R' Akiva** said to him, leftover blood is just leftover of a mitzvah!? **R' Nechemya** said, the limbs and fats are also leftover of a mitzvah and yet one who offers them outside is chayuv! **R' Akiva** said, those are different, because their burning is the start of a new Avodah, whereas the offering of the leftover blood is not. Now, if **R' Nechemya** really holds that the offering of the leftover blood is essential, that should have been his response to **R' Akiva**!? **TEYUFTA** of **R' Yochanan**.
 - However, now that **R' Ada bar Ahava** has said that **R' Nechemya** only says that the pouring of the leftover blood from a korbon offered on the inside Mizbe'ach is essential, but agrees that leftover blood from the outside Mizbe'ach is not essential, we can say that in our Mishna he is discussing the offering of leftover inside blood outside the Azarah, and in the Braisa he is discussing the leftover blood from the outside Mizbe'ach (in the Azarah).
 - **Q:** From the fact that **R' Nechemya** didn't explain this difference to **R' Akiva**, it must be that he doesn't make this differentiation!? **A:** Rather, he holds that leftover blood of both Mizbeichos are essential. However, in the conversation with **R' Akiva** he was answering according to the view of **R' Akiva**, that the leftover blood is not essential.

MISHNA

- If one does melika on a bird korbon inside the Azarah and then offers it outside the Azarah, he is chayuv. If he does the melika outside and offers it up outside, he is patur. If one shechted a bird korbon inside the Azarah and then offered it outside, he is patur. If he shechted it outside and offered it outside, he is chayuv. The result is, that what makes it valid inside is what makes it patur outside (the melika), and what makes it valid outside is what makes it patur inside (the shechita). **R' Shimon** says, any korbon for which one is chayuv for offering outside when the avodah (the shechita or melika) was done outside, he is also chayuv when the avodah was done inside and then offered outside, except for the case of one who shechted the bird inside and then offered it outside (he is patur even though had he done the shechita outside he would have been chayuv).

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna refers to the shechita outside as the way to make it valid. That is not correct – that is the way to make him chayuv!? **A:** Read the Mishna as if it says “that is the way to make him chayuv”.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

R' SHIMON OMER...

- **Q:** What part of the **T”K** is **R’ Shimon** coming to argue on? It can’t be referring to the first case, where if he does the melika inside he is chayuv but if he does it outside he is patur, because then he shouldn’t have said “any korbon for which one is chayuv for offering outside when the avodah (the shechita or melika) was done *outside* he is also chayuv when the avodah was done *inside*”, but should have instead said that when he is chayuv when the avodah was done *inside*...!?! You can’t say that he means to say that just as one is patur when the melika is done outside, he is also patur when the melika is done inside, because then he should have said “any korbon for which one is *not* chayuv...”!?! You can’t say that he is referring to the case of the shechita done inside, and is saying that one is also patur when the shechita is done outside, because he again should have said “any korbon for which one is *not* chayuv”!?! You also can’t say that he is referring to where the shechita is done outside and he is saying that just as he is chayuv there he would also be chayuv when the shechita is done inside, because he explicitly says that when the shechita is done inside and offered outside he will be patur!?! **A:** **Ze’iri** said, the machlokes is regarding an animal that was shechted at night. The **T”K** says that if an animal is shechted at night inside and then offered outside he is patur, but if he shechted it at night *outside* and offered it he would be chayuv. **R’ Shimon** says, just as he is chayuv for nighttime shechita outside followed by the offering outside, he would also be chayuv for offering an animal outside that was shechted at night inside as well. **A2:** **Rava** said, the machlokes is regarding the case when the kabbalah was not done in a kli shareis. The **T”K** says that if the kabbalah was done not in a kli shareis inside and then offered outside he is patur, but if the kabbalah was done not in a kli shares *outside* and offered outside he would be chayuv. **R’ Shimon** says, just as he is chayuv for kabbalah not in a kli shareis outside followed by the offering outside, he would also be chayuv for offering an animal outside when the kabbalah was done not in a kli shareis inside as well. **A3:** Now that the father of **R’ Shmuel** taught a Braisa that says that if one does the melika inside and offers it outside he is chayuv, but if he does the melika outside and offers it outside he is patur, but **R’ Shimon** says he is chayuv, we can even say that **R’ Shimon** in our Mishna is going on the first case, and change the words of the Mishna to say that he says that any korbon for which one is chayuv for offering it outside when the avodah (the melika) is done inside, one would also be chayuv for offering it outside when that avodah was done outside as well.

MISHNA

- If the kabbalah of the blood of a chatas was done in one keili, and he then applied some blood outside the Azarah and then some blood inside, or if he first applied some inside and then some outside, he would be chayuv for offering the blood outside since all of it is fit to be offered inside.
 - If the kabbalah was done in two keilim, if he applies the blood of both of them inside he is patur. If he applies the blood of both of them outside, he is chayuv. If he applies the blood of one inside and the other outside, he is patur. If he applies the blood of one outside and the other inside, he is chayuv for the one applied outside, but the blood that is applied inside is valid for the korbon that was brought.
 - What is this comparable to? To one who lost his chatas and separated another one in its place and then finds the first one and as them both standing in front of him. If he shechts them both inside he is patur. If he shechts them both outside he is chayuv. If he shechts one inside and one outside he is patur. If he shechts one outside and one inside, he is chayuv for the one shechted outside and the one shechted inside is a valid korbon.
 - With regard to them both being shechted inside, just as the blood of the first one makes its meat patur from me’ilah, so too it makes the meat of the second animal patur from me’ilah.

-----Daf ק”ב-----112-----

GEMARA

- **Q:** It makes sense that he is chayuv if he first applies the blood outside and then applies it inside, because the blood applied outside is fit to be applied inside. However, if he first applies the blood inside and then outside, the blood applied outside is leftover blood, and he should therefore not be chayuv for that!?! **A:** The Mishna follows the view of **R’ Nechemya**, who says that one is chayuv for applying leftover blood outside.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The next part of the Mishna says that if the blood was in two keilim and he applied the blood of one keili inside and of the second one outside, he is patur. Now, if the Mishna follows **R' Nechemya**, he should be chayuv in that case as well!? **A:** This part of the Mishna follows the view of the **T"K** who argues on **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** and holds that when the blood of one keili is applied it makes the blood in the other keili to be considered as "rejected", making it unfit to be applied inside. We can see from here that this **T"K** is **R' Nechemya**.

LEMAH HADAVAR DOMEH...

- **Q:** Why did the Mishna need to give us a comparison? **A:** The Mishna follows the view of **Rebbi**, who says that even if a chatas is lost at the time that its replacement is designated, it is left to die. The Mishna is saying that the reason he is patur when he shechted the second one outside is because the first one was lost and this second one therefore becomes passul when the first one was shechted inside. However, if a person initially designated two animals for his chatas, to have a guarantee in case something happens to the first one, the halacha is that the one that remains becomes an olah (it is left to graze, get a mum, and is then sold, with the proceeds used to purchase an olah), and therefore if it is shechted outside the person would be chayuv. We find that **R' Huna in the name of Rav** says this as well, that an ashm that has been sent for grazing, to get a mum, and to be sold with the proceeds to be used for an olah, and the ashm is then shechted without specific intent, it gets the status of an olah.
 - **Q:** The case of **R' Huna** is very different, because an ashm is brought from a male animal and an olah is brought from a female animal. However, a chatas is brought from a female animal, and therefore cannot become an olah!? **A:** **R' Chiya of Miyustinya** said, the Mishna is referring to the goat chatas of the Nasi, which is a chatas brought from a male animal.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HASHOCHET V'HAMAALAH!!!

PEREK PARAS CHATAS -- PEREK ARBA'AH ASSAR

MISHNA

- If the parah adumah was burned outside of its pit (which was made for it to be burned on Har Hazeisim), or if the goat to be sent to the Azazel was offered up outside the Azarah, the person who did so would be patur. This is based on the pasuk of "v'ehl pesach Ohel Moed lo havi'o", which teaches that anything that is not fit to be brought to the entrance of the Ohel Moed would not make someone chayuv for offering them outside.
 - An animal that sodomized a person, an animal that was sodomized by a man, an animal that was designated to be used for avoda zara, an animal that was worshipped as avoda zara, an animal that was exchanged for a dog, an animal that was the payment of a zonah, an animal of kilayim, an animal that was a treifah, or an animal that was born via Caesarean section, which one offered up outside the Azarah, would not make the person chayuv. This is learned from the pasuk of "lifnei Mishkan Hashem", which teaches that something that is not fit to be brought as a korbon to Hashem would not make someone chayuv for his offering it up outside.
 - An animal that has a mum, whether it is a permanent mum or a temporary mum, that was offered outside, the person who does so will be patur. **R' Shimon** says, if it had a permanent mum he would be patur, but if it had a temporary mum he would be chayuv for being oiver a lav.
 - With regard to "torim" (type of bird used for a korbon) that were too young to be used, or "bnei yonah" (another type of bird used for a korbon) that were too old to be used, that were offered outside, he would be patur. **R' Shimon** says, if he offered bnei yonah that were too old he would be patur, but if he offered torim that were too young he would be chayuv for being oiver a lav.
 - With regard to an animal and its offspring (which may not be shechted on the same day, and therefore if one was shechted and the other was then offered outside), or an animal that is missing time to be valid for a korbon, he would be patur. **R' Shimon** says, he would be chayuv for being oiver a lav. **R' Shimon's** view (in all the above) is that anything that will be fit to be brought as a korbon in the future is

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

now subject to a lav for offering it outside, but is not subject to kares. The **Chachomim** say that anything that is not subject to kares (for offering it outside) would also not be subject to a lav.

- When the Mishna discussed that one who offered outside an animal that “is missing time to be valid”, this refers to whether the animal itself was not yet ready to be offered as a korbon (it had not yet reached the age of 8 days old), or to where the owner was not yet ready to bring the korbon. What is a case of an owner who is not ready to bring his korbon? A zav, zavah, woman who has given birth, or a metzora, who offered their chatas and asham outside the Azarah before the time that they were able to bring their korbon, in which case they would be patur. However, if they offered their olah or shelamim outside, they would be chayuv (since they would be valid as voluntary korbanos).
- If one offers outside the meat of the chatas, or the meat of the asham, or the meat of other kodshei kodashim, or the meat of kodshei kalim, or the leftover of the Omer, or the Shteit Halechem, or the Lechem Hapanim, or the leftover of a mincha, or if one poured oil onto a mincha, or breaks it into pieces, or mixes the flour with the oil, or one who salts a korbon, or does tenufah on it, or did hagasha (the requirement to bring the mincha close to the Mizbe’ach), or set up the Lechem Hapanim on the Shulchan, or if he cleans out the menorah and prepares it, or takes a kometz from a mincha, or if one does a kabbalah – in all these cases if he did it outside the Azarah, he is patur.
 - Also, with regard to any of these acts, a non-Kohen would not be chayuv for doing them, a person would not be chayuv for doing them when tamei, or for not wearing the bigdei kehuna, or for not having washed his hands or feet.
- Until the Mishkan was put up it was mutar to have a bamah, and the Avodah on the bamah was done by the bechorim. Once the Mishkan was put up it became assur to bring a korbon on a bamah, and all the Avodah was only done by Kohanim, kodshei kodashim could only be eaten within the Azarah, and kodshei kalim could only be eaten anywhere in the Machaneh Yisrael.
 - When the Yidden reached Gilgal, bamos again became mutar, but kodshei kodashim could only be eaten inside the Azarah, and kodshei kalim could be eaten anywhere.
 - When the Yidden reached Shiloh, bamos again became assur. There was no permanent roof on the Mishkan in Shiloh, rather the rest of the structure was built of stone and the roof was made of material. Shiloh is the place referred to as “menuchah” in the Torah. Kodshei kodashim had to be eaten within the Azarah and kodshei kalim and maaser sheini could be eaten anywhere within sight of Shiloh.
 - When the Yidden reached Nov and Givon, bamos again became mutar. Kodshei kodashim had to be eaten within the Azarah and kodshei kalim could be eaten in all the cities of EY.
 - When the Yidden came to Yerushalayim, bamos again became assur and never again became mutar. Yerushalayim is the “nachalah” referred to in the Torah. Kodshei kodashim had to be eaten inside the Azarah, and kodshei kalim and maaser sheini had to be eaten within the walls of Yerushalayim.
- Any korbon that was made kadosh at a time when bamos were assur and was then offered outside the Azarah at a time when bamos were assur, are subject to an assei, a lo saasei, and a chiyuv kares. If a korbon was made kadosh when bamos were mutar and was then offered outside the Azarah at a time when bamos were assur, are subject to an assei, and a lo saasei, but there is no chiyuv kares. If a korbon was made kadosh at a time when bamos were assur and was then offered outside at a time when bamos were mutar, they are subject to an assei, but not to a lo saasei.
- The following korbanos had to be offered in the Mishkan even when bamos were mutar: korbanos that were made kodesh for the Mishkan and korbanos tzibbur. The korbon of an individual could be offered on a bamah. If an individual’s korbon was made kodesh for the Mishkan, it had to be offered in the Mishkan, but if it was offered on a bamah he would be patur.
 - What is the difference between the bamah of an individual and the bamah of the tzibbur? Smicha, shechting in the north, and blood applications all around are only done at the bamah of the tzibbur. With regard to tenufah, hagashah (bringing a mincha to the Mizbe’ach) – although **R’ Yehuda** holds that a mincha could not be brought on a bamah – the requirement that the Avodah be done by a Kohen, that it be done with bigdei kehunah, with klei shareis, that it bring a “reyach nicho’ach”, that it have a line at the midway point of the height, and that the person wash his hands and feet, also only apply to the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

bamah of the tzibbur. However, the psul of intent for beyond its time, of nossar, and of tamei, even apply to the bamah of an individual.

-----Daf ל"ג---113-----

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is meant when the Mishna refers to burning the parah adumah “outside of its pit”? **A: Reish Lakish** said, it means it was done outside the area that had been checked to assure that there is no tumas meis there. **R’ Yochanan** said, that can’t be correct, because all of EY is considered to be checked. Rather, the Mishna refers to a case where the parah adumah was burned inside Yerushalayim.
 - **Q:** Why doesn’t he explain the case as referring to where it was shechted outside Yerushalayim, but not opposite the opening to the Heichal, which **R’ Ada bar Ahava** learns from a hekesh is necessary for the parah adumah to be valid!? You can’t say that **R’ Yochanan** doesn’t darshen this hekesh, because we find that he explicitly does darshen this hekesh to teach this halacha!? **A: R’ Yochanan** is saying that certainly if it was shechted in the wrong place outside Yerushalayim it would be passul, but the Mishna is saying even more, that if it was shechted inside Yerushalayim, even though it is closer to the Heichal and we would therefore possibly think that it should be valid, it will also be passul.
 - **Q:** What is the point of machlokes between **R’ Yochanan** and **Reish Lakish**? **A: Reish Lakish** holds that the Mabul was in EY as well (and we must be concerned that there are people buried deep underground from the Mabul), whereas **R’ Yochanan** holds that there was no Mabul in EY. They actually both darshen the same pasuk, but darshen it differently, with these differing results.
 - **Q:** A Mishna describes the process of how certain children were raised in environments that precluded the possibility of the child becoming tamei from a meis, and these tahor children would draw water for the parah adumah process, if needed. The Mishna says, when going to the stream to draw the water, the child would be transported on a board over the back of an ox, so that the board would act as an ohel over the ground, just in case there was a meis buried at some point along the way, and tells of additional ways in which they made sure to protect them and the water from tumas meis. We clearly see that there was a concern for tumas meis in EY as well!? **A: R’ Huna the son of R’ Yehoshua** said, this was all done as an added chumra for parah adumah, but by strict halacha it did not have to be done.
 - **Q: R’ Yochanan** asked, a Braisa says that they once found human bones in the wood storage area of the Beis Hamikdash and they therefore wanted to be goizer tumah on all of Yerushalayim. **R’ Yehoshua** stood up and said, that that would be a disgrace! He said – where are the dead of the Mabul, and where are the dead of Nevuchadnetzar (none of these dead were ever found in EY)!? We see from here that the Mabul didn’t exist in EY!? **A: Reish Lakish** said, can it be said that the dead of Nevuchadnetzar were not in EY? Of course they were! Rather, it means that they were there and moved away. The same can be said about the dead of the Mabul.
 - **Q:** Still, this would seem to show that they have been moved away, which means that EY is free of tumah!? **A:** They were moved away from Yerushalayim, but not from the rest of EY. Therefore, since the parah adumah was done outside Yerushalayim, the place of its Avodah had to be checked for tumah.
 - **Others** said that it was **Reish Lakish** who asked based on **R’ Yehoshua**, that since we know the dead of Nevuchadnetzar were there, it must be that he was saying that the dead of the Mabul were there as well!? **A: R’ Yochanan** answered, it may be that the dead of Nevuchadnetzar were there, but the dead of the Mabul were not.
 - **Q: Reish Lakish** asked, “The pasuk says that everything that was on dry land died. This seems to include even the living things in EY. Now, according to me the reason the living things in EY died is because the Mabul was there. However, according to you, why did they die?” **A:** The Gemara explains, the died because of the extreme heat, as **R’ Chisda** learns from a pasuk.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Others** say that **R' Yochanan** asked based on this pasuk. "The pasuk says that everything on the *dry land* died. According to me there was dry land, because EY didn't have the Mabul. However, according to you, where was there dry land!?" **Reish Lakish** said, "It refers to the living things on the areas that used to be dry land." This is like **R' Chisda** said, that the fish did not die.
- **Q:** There is a humongous animal called the "re'eim" which survived the Mabul although it was too large to fit into the teiva. According to **R' Yochanan** we can say that it survived by going to EY, but according to **Reish Lakish** how did it survive? **A:** **R' Yannai** said, there were baby re'eim that were brought into the teiva that survived.
 - **Q:** **Rabbah bar bar Chana** said that he saw a baby re'eim, and it was tremendous (way too large to fit into the teiva)!? **A:** **R' Yochanan** said, its head went into the teiva.
 - **Q:** Even its head was too large to fit!? **A:** Rather, the tip of its nose went into the teiva, and that is how it survived.
 - **Q:** **R' Yochanan** said there was no Mabul in EY, so why is he giving another way for the re'eim to have survived? **A:** He is answering according to the view of **Reish Lakish**.
 - **Q:** The teiva's movement would cause its nose to slip out!? **A:** **Reish Lakish** said, it dug its horns into the teiva to stay in place.
 - **Q:** **R' Chisda** said that the water was boiling water, so how did it survive!? **A:** We see that the teiva didn't burn up, and that Og Melech Habashan survived in the water. There was a miracle that the side of the teiva remained cool, and that is how all these survived.
- **Q:** We find that **Reish Lakish** said that all the dead of the Mabul ended up settling in Bavel!? **A:** Most did, but some must have become rooted in EY as they rolled down to Bavel.

SA'IR HAMISHTALEI'ACH

- **Q:** Our Mishna says that the goat sent to the Azazel is excluded from the chiyuv for one who shechts it outside, because it is not fit to be brought "ehl pesach Ohel Moed". However, a Braisa says different. The Braisa says, the pasuk that forbids shechting a korbon outside the Azarah says "v'ehl pesach Ohel Moed lo hevio l'hakriv korbon LaShem". The word "korbon" alone would suggest that even bedek habayis animals are included in the prohibition (they are referred to as "korbon" as well). The pasuk therefore says "v'ehl pesach Ohel Moed..." The prohibition only applies to animals that are fit to be brought to the entrance of the Ohel Moed. Still, this would suggest that the Azazel goat is included (because it is brought to the entrance for the gorel and for the semicha process). The pasuk therefore says "LaShem", which teaches that only korbanos offered to Hashem are included. We see the Braisa bases this on the word "LaShem"!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to the goat before the gorel is done, whereas the Mishna is referring to the goat after the gorel was done.
 - **Q:** Even after the gorel the goat is still fit to be at the pesach Ohel Moed for the viduy of the Kohen Gadol!? **A:** Rather, **R' Mani** said, the Braisa is referring to the goat before the viduy is done, whereas the Mishna is referring to the goat after the viduy was done.

-----Daf 77?---114-----

HAROVEYA V'HANIRVA

- **Q:** Why can't this also be excluded by the pasuk of "pesach Ohel Moed"? Now, with regard to an animal that sodomized a person or that was sodomized by a person it makes sense that we need a different pasuk, for the case of where an animal was first made kadosh and only afterwards was involved in the sodomy (initially it was fit to be brought on the Mizbe'ach and therefore could not be excluded from "pesach Ohel Moed"). However, we cannot say the same for the case of the animal that was designated to be used for avodah zara or that was itself worshipped as avoda zara, because those labels cannot happen after the animal was Kadosh, because a person cannot make assur something that does not belong to him!? **A:** The Mishna is referring to kodshei kalim according to the view of **R' Yose Haglili**, who says that kodshei kalim are considered to be the property of the owner. Therefore, even after they were made kadosh they can become assur for being designated for avoda

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

zara or being worshipped as avoda zara. With regard to the psulim of an animal used to pay a zonah, or in exchange for a dog, or of kilayim, or born via a Caesarean section, they could not have been excluded based on the pasuk of “pesach Ohel Moed”, because the Mishna is referring to animals with these psulim that were offspring of kodashim animals, and the Mishna holds that they become kadosh at the time of their birth. Therefore, their psul set in before they became kadosh and that is why the psul took effect.

BAALEI MUMIN...OSO V'ES BENO...

- All these cases had to be taught in the Mishna. If the Mishna would have only taught regarding an animal with a mum we would have said that the **Rabanan** say he is patur in that case, because an animal with a mum is considered to be repulsive, but with regard to “torin” birds that are too young, maybe they would agree with **R' Shimon** that the person is oiver a lav. If the Mishna had only taught regarding the torin birds we would have said that it is there that **R' Shimon** says the person is oiver a lav, because these birds were never fit and then rejected, but an animal with a mum, which was fit and then rejected, maybe he would agree with the **Rabanan** that the person is patur. If the Mishna had only taught these two cases we would say that the **Rabanan** say the person is patur in these cases, because the psul is a psul in the animal or bird itself, but in the case of “oso v'es beno”, where it is not a psul in the body of the animal itself, maybe they would agree with **R' Shimon** that the person was oiver a mitzvah. That is why all three cases were needed to be taught.

SHEHAYA R' SHIMON OMER

- **R' Ila'ah in the name of Reish Lakish** said, that the view of **R' Shimon** is based on the pasuk which is understood as Moshe telling the Yidden that for the first 14 years after they enter EY (during the 7 of conquering and the 7 of dividing the land, which is when the Mishkan stood in Gilgal and bamos were allowed), one may bring nedavos on the bamos, but not obligatory korbanos. These obligatory korbanos during this time were considered premature, since they were not supposed to be brought until the Mishkan stood in Shiloh. Regarding this Moshe said “lo saasun” (do not bring these obligatory korbanos during that time). We see that there is a lav associated with bringing a korbon before its time.
 - **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked **R' Zeira**, if this is correct, why did **R' Zeira** say that there is no malkus associated with one who brings an animal before its time as a korbon even in the Mikdash (based on the drashos of other pesukim)? **A: R' Zeira** only said that according to the **Rabanan** who disagree with **R' Shimon** and say that “lo saasun” is not a lav for offering a korbon before its time. However, according to **R' Shimon** the person would be chayuv malkus. **A2: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, that we can't learn from the case of an obligatory korbon at Gilgal to a case of a korbon brought before its time in the Mikdash, because the bringing of an obligatory korbon at Gilgal is like bringing a korbon outside the Azarah.
 - **Rabbah** said that the view of **R' Shimon** is based on a Braisa. The Braisa says that **R' Shimon** learns from the pasuk of “lo suchal lizbo'ach ess hapasach b'achad she'arecha” that a Pesach may not be brought on a private Mizbe'ach once such a Mizbe'ach became assur to use. Before that time it was mutar to bring a Pesach on a private Mizbe'ach, based on the words “b'achad she'arecha”, which teaches that bringing it on a bamah is only assur when all of Klal Yisrael go to one city to bring their korbanos (i.e. at a time when bamos are assur). Now, when is **R' Shimon** saying that this lav applies? If it is when someone shechts it on a bamah on Erev Pesach after chatzos, there should even be kares, since he is shechting outside the Azarah something that is fit to be brought inside! Rather, it must be referring to where he shechted it before chatzos (which is before its time) and we see that **R' Shimon** says that it is subject to a lav!
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. The Braisa may be referring to where he shechts it after chatzos, and refers to a time when bamos are generally mutar. However, since the Pesach is an obligatory korbon there is a lav for it to be brought on a private bamah.
 - **Q: The Braisa** clearly said that it is referring to a time when bamos are assur!? **A: It** means that bamos are assur for this type of korbon, but it is a time when bamos would be mutar for other types of korbanos.

MECHUSAR ZMAN...

- **Q: The Gemara's** version of the Mishna did not have a metzora among the list of people in this part of the Mishna. The Gemara therefore asks that none of the people are required to bring an ashm (the zav, zavah,

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

woman who gave birth), so how does the Mishna say the case is that they brought their chatas but have not yet brought their asham? **A: Ze'iri** said, add the metzora to the list in the Mishna. A metzora does have to bring an asham.

OLOSEYHEN V'SHALMEYHEN

- **Q:** None of the people on the list are required to bring a shelamim!? **A: R' Sheishes** said, we must add the nazir to the list. A nazir does have to bring a shelamim.
- **R' Chilkiya bar Tuvi** said, when the Mishna said that one who shechts an asham outside the Azarah before its proper time he is patur, that is only if the asham was shechted lishma (since if offered in the Azarah like that at that time it would be passul). However, if it was shechted not lishma he would be chayuv (since it would be valid if shechted that way inside the Azarah).
 - **Q:** He should even be chayuv if he shechted it lishma, since even then it is fit to be shechted not lishma inside the Azarah!? **A:** As long as the name "asham" has not been uprooted from it, it is not considered to be fit as a korbon inside.
 - **Q: R' Huna** asked, is there anything that is not valid when shechted lishma but is valid when shechted not lishma? **A:** We have the case of a Pesach shechted during the rest of the year (besides Erev Pesach after chatzos), where if it is shechted lishma it is passul and if it is shechted not lishma it is valid!
 - The Gemara says, the case of Pesach is not a valid proof, because during the rest of the year a Pesach has the status of a Shelamim, which is valid whether shechted lishma or not lishma.

-----Daf 107-----115-----

- **Q:** The Gemara said that **R' Chilkiya bar Tuvi** holds that if a person shechted an asham that had not yet reached its time, not lishma, outside the Azarah, he is chayuv. The Gemara now says, maybe we can bring proof for this from a Braisa which says, we would think to exclude from the chiyuv for shechting outside, even an olah that is premature because of its owner (e.g. the olah of a metzora or woman who gave birth, and who can't go into the Azarah and can't yet fulfil their obligation with this korbon), or the asham of a nazir or of a metzora. The pasuk therefore says the extra words of "shor, kesev, and eiz". Now, the Braisa includes the case of asham but does not include a chatas. What is the case that the Braisa is referring to? It can't be where the asham is brought in its proper time, because he would be chayuv for a chatas as well! Therefore, it must be referring to when it is brought before its proper time. Now, it can't be referring to where the asham was brought lishmo, because then he would not be chayuv! Rather, it must be that it was brought not lishmo, and we see that a person is chayuv for the shechting outside of a premature asham that was shechted not lishmo! **A:** The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. The Braisa may be referring to where the asham was not premature, and it was shechted not lishmo, and the Braisa follows **R' Eliezer**, who says that we learn asham from chatas, that an asham shechted not lishmo is also passul. However, since if it would be brought inside without specific intent it would be valid, if it is brought outside he is chayuv (even though he brought it shelo lishmo).
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from a Braisa which says, we would think to include in the chiyuv for shechting outside, even an olah that is premature because of itself (it is not yet 8 days old), and a chatas that is premature either because of itself or because of its owner, the pasuk therefore says "v'ehl pesach Ohel Moed", which teaches that something that is not fit to be brought to the Mikdash would not make one chayuv for shechting it outside. Now, the Braisa did not discuss an asham. What is the case of the Braisa? It can't be referring to where the korbon was offered lishmo, because then the Braisa should list an asham as well as being patur! Rather, it is referring to where it is brought not lishmo, and that is why it doesn't list asham as being patur, because he would be chayuv for the premature asham brought outside when it is brought not lishmo! **A:** The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. The Braisa may be referring to where the asham was shechted not lishmo, and the Braisa follows **R' Eliezer**, who says that we learn asham from chatas, that an asham shechted not lishmo is also passul.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from **R' Dimi**, who said that the yeshiva of **Bar Liva'i** taught a Braisa which, as the Braisa quoted above, says we would think to exclude from the chiyuv for shechting outside, even an olah that is premature because of its owner (e.g. the olah of a metzora or woman who gave birth, and who can't go into the Azarah and can't yet fulfil their obligation with this korbon), or the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

asham of a nazir or of a metzora. **Ravina** said, the Braisa says that the pasuk therefore says the extra words of “shor, kesev, and eiz”. Now, the Braisa includes the case of asham but does not include a chatas. As we said above, the Braisa must be referring to where it was brought not lishmo, and we see that a person is chayuv for the schechting outside of a premature asham that was shechted not lishmo!

- **Q:** The Gemara asks, we have already explained how to interpret such a Braisa as referring to where the asham was not premature, and it was shechted not lishmo, and the Braisa follows **R’ Eliezer!**? **A: R’ Nachman** said, the Gemara is bringing its proof from a contradiction between this Braisa and a Braisa taught by the yeshiva of **Levi**, which says that an asham of a nazir or a metzora that are shechted not lishma are valid but don’t fulfil the obligation of the owner. If it is shechted premature because of the owner, or if they were past the age of when they could be brought as an asham, they are passul. This suggests that if a premature asham was shechted outside, the person would be patur. **R’ Dimi** answered this contradiction by saying that the Braisa of **Levi** refers to where it was shechted lishmo and the Braisa of **Leiva’I** refers to where it was shechted not lishmo (and is therefore fit to be brought in the Azarah). We see that **R’ Dimi** understood the Braisa of **Leiva’I** as referring to where the asham was premature, and is therefore a proof to **R’ Chilkiya bar Tuvi!**
- **Q:** Should we say that this is a TEYUFTA of **R’ Huna** (who argues on **R’ Chilkiya bar Tuvi**)? **A: R’ Huna** could say that the Braisa is dealing with a case where a person designated 2 ashamos, as a guarantee (and then shechted one prematurely outside for the sake of an olah). In this case this olah is fit to be brought in the Azarah because the halacha is that when 2 ashamos are designated in this way, one of them is an olah from the very beginning, as is stated by **R’ Huna in the name of Rav**.

HAMAALEH M’BSAR CHATAS...

- A Braisa says, how do we know that one who offers the meat of a chatas or of an asham, or of kodshei kodashim, or of kodshei kalim, or of the leftovers of the Omer, or of the Shte Halechem, or of the Lechem Hapanim, or of the leftover of a mincha, is patur? The pasuk regarding offering outside says “olah”. This teaches that just as an olah is fit to be brought up onto the Mizbe’ach, so too one is chayuv only for things that are fit to be brought up onto the Mizbe’ach. How do we know that also one who pours oil on a mincha, mixes the oil and the flour, breaks the mincha into pieces, salts a korbon, does tenufah, does hagasha, sets up the Lechem Hapanim on the Shulchan, prepares the Menorah, takes a kometz, or does kabbalah, in each case outside the Azarah, is also patur? The pasuk says “asher yaaleh olah oy zavach”, which teaches that just as bringing up onto the Mizbe’ach is the final avodah to be done, so too one is only chayuv outside for an act that is the final avodah to be done.

AHD SHELO HUKAM HAMISHKAN...

- **Q: R’ Huna bar R’ Katina** was sitting by **R’ Chisda** and said that **R’ Assi** said that the bechorim did the Avodah only at Har Sinai. Immediately after that the Kohanim began to do the Avodah. **R’ Chisda** was going to refute this based on our Mishna (that says the bechorim did the Avodah until the Mishkan was built), but he then heard that **R’ Huna** in the name of **R’ Ada bar Ahava** said that the olah that was brought by the Yidden in the Midbar did not need to be skinned and cut into pieces. **R’ Chisda** then decided to refute both of these statements from one Braisa which explicitly says that bamos were mutar until the Mishkan was built and that the bechorim did the Avodah until the Mishkan was built. The Braisa gives other rulings, among them is the ruling that the olah that the Yidden brought in the Midbar did need to be skinned and cut into pieces. The Braisa refutes **R’ Huna!**? **A:** The Gemara says, the question of who did the Avodah until the Mishkan was built is actually a machlokes Tanna’im (so the Braisa therefore can’t refute **R’ Huna**). A Braisa says that **R’ Yehoshua ben Korcha** says that the pasuk that warns that the Kohanim should stay away from Har Sinai refers to the bechorim (they were the “kohanim” at that time, until the Mishkan) and **Rebbi** says it refers to Nadav and Avihu (they took over as the kohanim from that point in time, which is what **R’ Huna** said).
 - **Q:** According to **Rebbi** we can understand that pasuk to mean that says that Nadav and Avihu were warned before doing the act that brought about their deaths (it is this warning at Har Sinai, which was directed to them). However, according to **R’ Yehoshua**, where were they warned? **A:** It is the pasuk that

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

says that the Mishkan will be made holy “bichvodi”, which we darshen as saying “bichvodai” (through the deaths of My honored ones). Based on this, when Nadav and Avihu died, Moshe told Aharon that his sons had died only to make a Kiddush Hashem. Upon hearing that, Aharon remained silent (“vayidom Aharon”), and he received reward for doing so. We find that Dovid in Tehillim also discusses the importance of remaining silent in the face of Judgment, and Shlomo does the same in a pasuk in Mishlei.

- **Q:** How do we answer the fact that the Braisa says that the olah that the Yidden brought in the Midbar needed to be skinned and cut into pieces? **A:** This too is a matter of machlokes among Tanna'im in a Braisa where **R' Yishmael** says that only the general principles of the mitzvos were taught at Sinai, but the details were not taught until later on at the Mishkan (which would mean the details of skinning and cutting into pieces were not taught until then). **R' Akiva** says that even the details were taught at Sinai.
- The Braisa quoted above said that all types of animals were allowed to be brought as korbanos before the Mishkan was built. **R' Huna** said we learn this from the pasuk regarding Noach which says ‘vayiven Noach Mizbe'ach La'Hashem vayikach mikol habeheima hatehorah umikol ha'of hatahor”.
 - The word “beheima” refers to a domesticated animal, and also includes chayos as well.
 - The Braisa says that they were also allowed to bring males and females, without mumin and even with mumin. This is based on the fact that there is no requirement of gender or of not having a mum for a bird, and the pasuk makes a hekesh from birds to animals.
 - Although it could have a mum, it could not be missing a limb. **R' Elazar** explains, the pasuk regarding the bringing of the animals into the teiva says “umikol hachai mikol basar shnayim mikol...” which teaches that Bnei Noach cannot bring a korbon that is missing a limb.
 - **Q:** That pasuk is needed to exclude the bringing of a treifa into the teiva, and is therefore not available to exclude animals that area missing a limb!? **A:** A treifa is excluded from the pasuk of “l'chayos zerah”.
 - **Q:** That makes sense according to the view that a treifa cannot give birth. However, what about the view that a treifa can give birth? **A:** That view would say that a treifa is excluded by the word “itach”, which teaches that the animals had to be like Noach, who was not a treifa.
 - **Q:** Maybe Noach was a treifa? **A:** The pasuk says he was “tamim” (complete).
 - **Q:** Maybe “tamim” refers to his ways? **A:** The pasuk says he was a tzaddik, so that already teaches that he was complete in his ways.
 - **Q:** Maybe “tamim” refers to his ways and “tzaddik” refers to his deeds? **A:** It can't be that Noach was a treifa, because then when Hashem said to take in animals “like you” He meant that only animals that were treifos should be brought into the teiva. That does not make sense.
 - **Q:** If we exclude treifos based on “itach”, why do we need the pasuk of “l'chayos zerah”? **A:** From “itach” we would think to exclude a treifa only so that they don't die during the year in the teiva and can provide companionship for Noach, but an old or sterile animal would be ok. The pasuk therefore says “l'chayos zerah” to teach that the animal must be able to have offspring.

-----Daf תולך-----116-----

TEHORIN AVAL LO TIMEYIN

- **Q:** The Braisa said that even before the Mishkan was built, only kosher animals could be brought as korbanos. Now, before the Torah there was no such thing as kosher and non-kosher animals!? **A:** **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonason** said, it means that only animals that were destined to be kosher were allowed to be offered.
 - **Q:** How did they know which animals were destined to be kosher? **A:** It is as **R' Chisda** said regarding how Noach knew which were the kosher animals of which he had to take 7 pairs into the teiva. He said that Noach took all the animals and had them walk by the teiva. The animals that the teiva took 7 pairs

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

of, were the ones that were kosher. **R' Avahu** said, the ones that were kosher came to the teiva in pairs of 7 by themselves.

- **Q:** The Braisa said that all korbanos brought before the Mishkan was built were olos. The Gemara asks, the pasuk regarding the Yidden at Har Sinai says “vayizbichu zevachim shelamim La’Hashem parim”, which shows that they offered shelamim!? **A:** The Braisa should be understood as saying that olos were offered on behalf of everybody (not that only olos could be offered), but shelamim were offered on behalf of some, but not all – only Yidden could bring Shelamim, but goyim could not.
- The Braisa follows the view that a Bnei Noach may not offer a shelamim. This is the subject of a machlokes between **R' Elazar and R' Yose bar Chanina**. The view that says a Bnei Noach may bring a shelamim learns this from the pasuk regarding Hevel which says that he offered the fats of his animals. What type of animal has its fats offered, but not its meat? It is a shelamim. The other view is based on a drasha of the pasuk “uri tzafon ubo’l seiman”, which he says “uri tzafon” refers to the goyim, who may only bring korbanos that must be brought in the north, which refers to an olah.
 - The second view understands the “fats” of Hevel’s animals to refer to the choicest of his animals, not the actual fats. The first view darshens the pasuk of “uri tzafon” to refer to the gathering of the Yidden from galus.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says that Moshe told Paroh that he must give the Yidden animals for “zevachim v’olos”, and zevachim refers to shelamim!? **A:** The zevachim refer to animals shechted for eating and olos refer to korbanos to be offered to Hashem.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says that Yisro offered “olah uzevachim”!? **A:** That was after Matan Torah, and therefore the Yidden were no longer considered to be Bnei Noach.
 - **Q:** What will we answer according to the view that this story of Yisro happened before Matan Torah? **A:** That view will hold that Bnei Noach may offer a shelamim.
 - The exact time that Yisro came to the Yidden is actually a machlokes among Tanna’im in a Braisa. **R' Yehoshua** says, he came after hearing about the war with Amalek. **R' Elazar Hamodai** says, he came after hearing about Matan Torah. **R' Eliezer** says, he came after hearing about Kriyas Yam Suf.
- The Braisa said that goyim may offer korbanos on a bamah even today. A Braisa explains, this is based on the fact that the pasuk that makes it assur to bring a korbon anywhere other than in the Mikdash says “daber ehl Bnei Yisrael”, which teaches that it is only the Yidden who are commanded regarding this.
 - **R' Yaakov bar Acha in the name of R' Assi** said, it is assur for Yidden to help them do this or to be his shaliach to do so. **Rabbah** said, it is mutar to teach them the proper way to do it, as we see that **Rava** told **R' Safra and R' Acha bar Huna** to instruct goyim on how to properly bring a korbon for Ifra Hurmiz, the mother of Shvor Malka, upon her request.
 - **Q:** In his instruction, **Rava** told them to make sure the korbon was brought using new wood. **Abaye** said to **Rava**, you must have said this according to the view of **R' Elazar ben Shamu’ah** in a Braisa, who says that the wood used on the Mizbe’ach must be new wood. However, we find that **R' Elazar ben Shamu’ah** says in a Braisa that Dovid offered korbanos on the place of the future Beis Hamikdash and used wood of “morigim and cattle equipment”. We see that there is no requirement to use new wood on a bamah!? **A:** **Rava** could answer that these items had never been used, and were therefore considered to be new wood.
 - **Ulla and Abaye** explain that “morigim” is a type of tool used for threshing.

KODASHIM KALIM NE’ECHALIM B’CHOL MACHANEH YISRAEL

- **R' Huna** said, the Mishna means that kodashim kalim can be eaten in any place of a Yid. The Gemara understands this to mean that in the Midbar there was no area that had the status of the Machaneh Yisrael.
 - **Q:** **R' Nachman** asked **R' Huna**, a Braisa says that just as there were set machanos in the Midbar, there are corresponding machanos in Yerushalayim!? **A:** Rather, **R' Huna** meant that kodashim kalim may be eaten anywhere in the Machaneh Yisrael, even if because of travelling that Machaneh was in a different place than where it was when the korbon was shechted.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** That seems obvious!? **A:** We would have thought that the fact that the Mishkan was taken down makes the korbanos to be considered as if they have now left the machanos and become passul.
 - **Q:** Why don't we say that this is indeed the case? **A:** The pasuk says "v'nasah Ohel Moed", which teaches that even as it was travelling it had the status of the Ohel Moed, which therefore meant that the Machanos kept their status as well.

-----Daf 117-----

- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Yochai** says there was another machaneh (besides the Machaneh Shechina, Machaneh Leviya, and Machaneh Yisrael), which was in the enclosure of the Ezras Nashim (which they were goizer that a tvul yom may not enter) but there was no punishment associated with it. In Shiloh there were only two machanos.
 - **Q:** Which machaneh was missing in Shiloh? **A: Rabbah** said, it would make sense to say that there was a Machaneh Leviya, because if not, then zavim and people who were tamei meis would be treated the same and only be sent out of one machaneh (since they are allowed to be in Machaneh Yisrael), which can't be right, because of a drasha on the pasuk of "v'lo yitam'u es machaneyhem", which teaches that they are not supposed to be the same in this respect.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, if you say that it is the Machaneh Yisrael that did not exist there, then it would come out that a zav and a metzora would be sent out to the same place (outside the Machaneh Leviya), which is problematic based on the pasuk of "badad yeishev", which teaches that a metzora is supposed to be sent out to a place where no other tamei person is sent out!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, that all 3 machanos existed in Shiloh. When the Braisa says there were only 2 machanos, it means that the Machaneh Leviya at Shiloh did not act as an "ihr miklat" to save a person who killed b'shogeg. We are taught that in the Midbar the Machaneh Leviya did have this characteristic. The Braisa is teaching that at Shiloh it did not.

BA'U LAGILGAL

- A Braisa says, any neder or nedavah could be brought on a private bamah. A korbon that was not a neder or nedavah (but was rather obligatory) may not be brought on a private bamah. **R' Meir** holds that a mincha and korbon nazir may be brought on a private bamah. The **Chachomim** said, a person was only allowed to bring olos and shelamim on a private bamah. **R' Yehuda** said, any korbon that the tzibbur or an individual was allowed to bring in the Ohel Moed in the Midbar, they could also bring at the bamah of the tzibbur at the Ohel Moed in Gilgal. If so, what is the difference between the Ohel Moed of the Midbar and the Ohel Moed of Gilgal? During the time of the Ohel Moed in the Midbar, bamos were assur. During the time of the Ohel Moed in Gilgal they were mutar. With regard to a private bamah, a person could only offer olos and shelamim on it. The **Chachomim** said, any korbon that the tzibbur was allowed to bring in the Ohel Moed in the Midbar, they could also bring at the bamah of the tzibbur at the Ohel Moed in Gilgal. However, on the bamah of the tzibbur and on the bamah of an individual, an individual could only bring olos and shelamim (but not obligatory korbanos). **R' Shimon** said, even the tzibbur did not bring obligatory korbanos on the bamah of the tzibbur, except for the Korbon Pesach and other obligatory korbanos that had a fixed time to be brought.
 - **R' Meir's** view (that obligatory korbanos may not be brought on the bamah on an individual) is based on the pasuk that says "lo sausun kichol asher anachnu osim poh hayom". This pasuk teaches that Moshe told the Yidden that for the first 14 years after they enter EY, only voluntary korbanos may be offered. **R' Meir** holds that menachos and the korbanos of a nazir fall into this permitted category as well, whereas the **Rabanan** hold that a mincha was never brought on a bamah, and the korbanos of a nazir are considered to be obligatory.
 - **Shmuel** says, the machlokes regarding the korbanos of the nazir is only in regard to the chatas and ashm that a nazir must bring, but all would agree that the olos and shelamim of a nazir could be brought on the bamah.
 - **Q: Rabbah** asked, a Braisa says that the tenufa of the chazeh v'shok of a shelamim or todah is only done by the tzibbur's bamah, not by the bamah of an individual. The same

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

is for the separation of 4 loaves of the todah. The reason for this is that the pasuk regarding these says “LaHashem”, which means it may not be done at a private bamah. Now, the shelamim of a nazir requires that there is also a tenufa of its front leg which is then cooked, and the pasuk there also says that it must be done in front of Hashem, which would mean that it may only be done at the bamah of the tzibbur. Why did the Braisa not list this as well? Now, if the **Rabanan** argue with **R’ Meir** regarding the nazir’s olah and shelamim as well, we can say that the Braisa follows the **Rabanan**, and since they hold the nazir’s shelamim may not be brought on an individual’s bamah there is no reason to say that the tenufah of the leg can’t be done there. However, according to **Shmuel**, who says that the **Rabanan** say the shelamim may be brought at the private bamah, why doesn’t the Braisa list this tenufah as well!? **A:** We must say that **Shmuel’s** statement was that **R’ Meir and the Rabanan** argue with regard to the nazir’s olah and shelamim, but all agree that the chatas and asham are considered to be obligatory offerings and therefore may not be brought on the bamah.

- The Braisa said that the **Chachomim** said, any korban that the tzibbur was allowed to bring in the Ohel Moed in the Midbar, they could also bring at the bamah of the tzibbur at the Ohel Moed in Gilgal. The view of the **Chachomim** is based on the pasuk of “ish hayashar be’ainav yaaseh”. This is understood to teach that an “ish” – an individual – only “yesharos”, voluntary korbanos, may be brought even on the bamah of the tzibbur, but obligatory korbanos may not be brought. The tzibbur, on the other hand, may even bring obligatory korbanos. **R’ Yehuda** would say that the pasuk says “hayashar *be’ainav*”, which refers to a private bamah, and says that it is there where only voluntary korbanos may be brought, but on the bamah of the tzibbur even an individual may bring an obligatory korban.
 - **Q:** According to **R’ Yehuda**, how would he understand the word “ish”? **A:** That comes to validate a non-Kohen to do the avodah on a bamah.
 - **Q:** This is learned from the pasuk of “v’zarak haKohen es hadam ahl Mizbach Hashem”!? **A:** If we only had that pasuk we would think that a bechor may do the avodah on the bamah, but that there must be the sanctification of bechorim as there was originally. The pasuk of “ish” teaches that this is not necessary.
 - **Q:** The view of the **Chachomim** seems to be the same as the view of the **T”K** (the **Rabanan** who argue on **R’ Meir** earlier)!? **A:** **R’ Pappa** said, the difference between them is whether nesachim were brought in the Midbar, on the bamah of the tzibbur, and on a private bamah.