

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

Another unsuccessful challenge is recorded to Rabbar bar Avuha's ruling that when a person declares, "A bull amongst my bulls" he intends only the largest one.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses bringing korbanos in Beis Chonyo and one who vows to bring a korban in Beis Chonyo.

3) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Mishnah's ruling that in one instance one could fulfill his vow by offering a korban in Beis Chonyo is challenged.

R' Hamnuna resolves this challenge.

This resolution is unsuccessfully challenged.

4) **MISHNAH:** The status of kohanim who served in Beis Chonyo is discussed.

5) Slaughtering before an idol

R' Yehudah rules that one who slaughters before an idol and repents may then serve in the Beis HaMikdash.

The source for this ruling is presented.

R' Nachman and R' Sheishes disagree about the status of a kohen who inadvertently threw blood towards an idol because he inadvertently thought it was permitted.

Their respective sources and the exchange between them are presented.

It is noted that each one is consistent with another position that he maintains.

Two additional disputes between R' Nachman and R' Sheishes are presented that relate to the same issue.

The necessity for this dispute to be presented in four different contexts is explained.

6) Beis Chonyo

The Gemara infers from the Mishnah that the Tanna of the Mishnah subscribes to the opinion that Beis Chonyo was not a house of idolatry.

A Baraisa is cited that elaborates on the history of Beis Chonyo.

Another Baraisa further emphasizes the effects of becoming accustomed to a position of honor.

Mar Kashisha the son of R' Chisda explains how R' Meir explains the verse cited by R' Yehudah. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

A kohen who officiated at Beis Chonyo

הכהנים ששמשו בבית חוניו לא ישמשו במקדש שבירושלים

The Mishnah rules that any kohen who officiated at the temple which was located at Beis Chonyo was thereby disqualified from serving in the Beis HaMikdash in Yerushalayim. Even a kohen who performed his service at Beis Chonyo with pure motives and for the sake of heaven, was still penalized by the sages never to serve again in the Beis HaMikdash. They were expected to realize that it was prohibited for them to be in violation of bringing offerings outside the Beis HaMikdash in Yerushalayim, and any offering in Beis Chonyo was no better than a private altar, which was prohibited at that time.

Sfas Emes questions whether this penalty was applied specifically to those who officiated at Beis Chonyo, because it was fashioned using the pattern of the Beis HaMikdash, and many kohanim were drawn to work there because the gentiles attracted the kohanim by paying them high salaries to come and bring offerings on their behalf. In this regard, it could be that the sages saw that it was necessary to confront this particular threat by penalizing the kohanim, but this penalty did not apply to other kohanim who officiated at other private altars. Or, perhaps the penalty we find here was applied to any kohen who worked at any private altar. According to this, the Mishnah only listed Beis Chonyo as an example, because it was mentioned in the previous Mishnah, but the halacha here applies to a kohen who officiated at any private altar. Sfas Emes leaves this inquiry unresolved.

Regarding the extent to which this penalty was applied, Rambam writes (Hilchos Bi'as Mikdash 9:14) that although a kohen was disqualified for service in the Beis HaMikdash after having served at Beis Chonyo, if he did officiate the service would not be ruined. The Achronim offer various explanations for this opinion of Rambam.

Mahar"i Kurkos points out that the Mishnah rules that if a kohen served at Beis Chonyo it was prohibited for him to then serve in the Beis HaMikdash. If the Mishnah wished to say that his service would then be completely disqualified, it would have said so explicitly, as this would have been a greater statement to make. Therefore, it is clear that the service of such a kohen is not allowed, but it would be acceptable after the fact.

Radba"z writes that we find in our Gemara that there is a disagreement regarding the status of a kohen who worshipped idolatry, who also is not allowed to subsequently work in the Beis HaMikdash, and whether his service is disqualified or not. This implies that service at Beis Chonyo, which according to all opinions is not idolatry, would certainly not cause the kohen's later service in the Beis HaMikdash to be disqualified. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Disqualifying someone from serving as a slaughterer

ככהנים ששמשו בבית חוניו לא ישמשו במקדש שבירושלים

Kohanim who served in Beis Chonyo may not serve in the Mikdash of Yerushalayim

Maharam Shik¹ was asked whether it is permitted for one to eat from a slaughterer who had served as the sh'liach tzibbur and slaughterer for a Reform Temple. Maharam Shik cited our Gemara that teaches that kohanim who served in the Beis Chonya, a temple built in Alexandria, Egypt, may not serve again in the Beis HaMikdash and certainly a kohen who served in an idolatrous temple was not permitted to serve in the Beis HaMikdash. The Gemara Avodah Zarah (52b) explains that even if the kohen repented for this transgression he was not permitted to serve in the Beis HaMikdash either as a penalty or because he made himself vile to God. Although according to R' Yehudah, Beis Chonyo was not a house of idolatry and the issue with serving there was that it involved slaughtering a korban outside of the Beis HaMikdash; nevertheless, the transgression was considered severe enough that a kohen who served there was no longer permitted to serve in the Beis HaMikdash. Since Poskim equate the Beis HaKnesses to the Beis HaMikdash in many ways² it follows then that one who served as a sh'liach tzibbur and the slaughterer for a Reform Temple should be permanently disqualified.

Even if the reason he served in the Reform Temple was due to financial pressure the halacha is that one must be willing to forgo all of his money to avoid violating a prohibition. Moreover, even if we say that the pressure got to him and he

REVIEW and Remember

1. How does R' Hamnuna explain the halacha in the Mishnah that one who stipulated that he would bring a korban in Beis Chonyo and does so that he fulfills his obligation?
2. What is the source that serving idolatry does not permanently disqualify a kohen from serving in the Beis HaMikdash?
3. Why is it necessary to present the dispute between R' Nachman and R' Sheishes in four contexts?
4. Why did the masses want to kill Chonyo?

was not able to muster the strength to forgo a good paying job when he was so desperate and he should be considered an *ones*, nevertheless, his service there makes him vile. Precedent for this is the halacha that vessels used in Beis Chonyo could not be used for the Beis HaMikdash. Obviously vessels cannot be penalized and the reason they were unfit for use was that they had become vile by their use outside of the Beis HaMikdash. **בדיעבד**, in a pressing circumstance he could be chosen since a korban offered by one who had served in Beis Chonyo would be valid. ■

1. שו"ת מהר"ם שיק יו"ד סי' י"ט.
2. ע"י שו"ע או"ח סי' ק"י וקנ"א. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

For God Alone

"ואין צריך לומר לדבר אחר..."

Acertain rabbi wished to keep his congregants happy. He knew that one way was to hire a chazzan with a magnificent voice. Unfortunately the person with the nicest voice in his city was not Jewish. Yet he was educated and for a good wage was willing to sing in shul—but of course was ineligible to lead the services. After thinking about this conundrum the Rabbi thought he had a solution. A Jewish chazzan would lead

the prayers. But the non-Jew would harmonize with him to make davening more pleasant. Since this rabbi did not want to do anything forbidden by halacha he decided to consult with the Vaychi Yosef of Pupa, zt"l, regarding this question. In his letter the rabbi clarified that, "If this is forbidden I want a clear source for this."

"It is certainly forbidden." the Rebbe replied. "As far as a source, this is clear from an explicit Mishnah in Menachos 109. There we find that even a kohen who served idolatry is forbidden to participate in the avodah in the Beis HaMikdash. Since in our time prayers take the place of sacrifices, a non-Jew

may not help a Jewish chazzan even if doing so would enhance the prayers."

When the rebbe told this story to his students he added. "I was pained by this strange inquiry since I wondered why it had come specifically to me. What message was God telling me? Eventually I understood this as a hint from heaven to improve my prayers. I need to be vigilant against the inner non-Jew—the yetzer hara—who sometimes steals into my thoughts while I pray. I must work hard to remove any trace of improper motivation caused by the yetzer hara. Instead my prayers must be only for God alone."¹

1. תולדות ויחי יוסף, ח"ב, ע"י שע"ט ■