

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) The Korban Pesach

A Baraisa places the bringing of the Korban Pesach between the afternoon Tamid and the afternoon ketores. A source for this ruling is presented.

A second Baraisa cites an opinion that rules that the Korban Pesach is brought after the ketores and lighting of the menorah.

### 2) Bringing a korbon after the afternoon Tamid

A Baraisa lists the order of the avodah in the Beis HaMikdash and presents a dispute whether one who is lacking atonement can bring a korbon after the afternoon Tamid was offered if it is necessary to be able to partake of a korban after nightfall.

The Gemara questions the second opinion which allows one to bring a korban after the afternoon Tamid.

Two explanations are presented and the Gemara unsuccessfully challenges one of the two explanations.

The Gemara unsuccessfully challenges R' Pappa's position, namely, that once the afternoon Tamid is offered one should take the korban of the one lacking atonement and place it on the altar.

R' Kahana, in response to his own question, explains that if the blood of a korban is offered before the afternoon Tamid the fats may be burned later without violating the commandment to bring the afternoon Tamid last.

### 3) The Korban Pesach

R' Safra highlights a difficulty in one of the pesukim that deals with the Korban Pesach.

Rav answers the difficulty by limiting the application of the pasuk to a particular circumstance.

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the consequence of offering a korban without the proper intent.

### 5) Clarifying the Mishnah

R' Pappa asks whether the case involving two intents involved two intents in one avodah or two intents in two different avodos. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Eating the meat of the offering and the atonement of the owner*

ואכלו אתם אשר כפר בהם, מלמד שהכהנים אוכלים והבעלים מתכפרים

The Torah associates the atonement of the owner of the offering with the eating of the meat of the korban by the kohanim. This teaches us that as long as the kohanim do not eat from the meat of the Chattas, the owner does not achieve his atonement. In the case of a person who is lacking טהרה until he successfully brings his offering (מחוסר כפורים), this owner cannot eat of any offerings until this process is complete.

Tosafos (ד"ה יכול), in the name of ריב"א, asks a question based upon the Gemara in Yevamos (90b). Blood from an offering became טמא. This impure blood was taken, and although it was disqualified, it was intentionally sprinkled upon the altar. The rule is that even the ציץ of the kohen gadol (which atones for impurities of offerings) cannot salvage the flesh of the offering to be permitted to be eaten, but the owner of the offering has procured his atonement. The reason is that, from a Torah perspective, the ציץ atones even for the sprinkling of the impure blood, and the rabbinic limitation against accepting the intentional misdeed of its being sprinkled does not prevent the owner from achieving his atonement. We see, notes Tosafos, that although the offering cannot be eaten by the kohen in this case, the owner still gets credit for his bringing the korban. If the eating of the meat is a prerequisite to atonement, how can this be so?

Tosafos answers that technically, on a Torah level, the tzitz atones even for an intentional misdeed of sprinkling the impure blood on the altar. There is a rabbinic limit which prohibits this, but our Gemara only hinges the atonement of the owners to a case where the meat could not be eaten at all, even on a Torah level. An example of when the meat is not allowed to be eaten is as we find in our Gemara, during the period before the burning of the limbs (הקטר חלבים). But in the case of the impure blood, the owners do achieve their atonement. ■

## HALACHAH Highlight

### Which comes first—the 'Chatas' or the 'Olah'?

והקריב את אשר לחטאת ראשונה מה תלמוד לומר וכו' אלא זה בנה אב לכל חטאות שיהו קודמות לכל עולות הבאות עמהן וכו' אמר רבא שאני עולת מצורע דרחמנא אמר והעלה

What does this come to teach us?...It teaches us that the laws of the Chatas offering take precedence over the laws of the Olah. Rava said, the laws of the Olas Metzora are different because the Torah refers to it with העולה.

The Rishonim argue on this point. According to the Ritva<sup>1</sup>, only in the case of the Chatas Metzora would we say that if the Olah came first (before the Chatas) it would still enact an atonement. However, in regard to other Chatas offerings, the Chatas must be brought before the Olah. Tosafos<sup>2</sup>, however, disagree and hold that if one, בדיעבד, brought the Olah before the Chatas, it would still atone. But ideally, one should bring the Chatas first. There is a practical difference between these opinions in how we say the morning korbanos services before Shacharis. The Mishna Berura<sup>3</sup> writes, "see the Magen Avrohom who says that if one knows that he incurred a Chatas obligation, he should recite its appropriate pesukim before the Olah." The Mishna Brura, however, adds that this is not the opinion of the rest of the Poskim.

The Maharsham<sup>4</sup> explains that the reason why some say the Olah before the Chatas is that they are acting in accord-

## REVIEW and Remember

1. According to the first Baraisa, why is the Korban Pesach brought before the ketores and the lighting of the menorah?
2. What is the rationale to permit offering a korban for one who lacks atonement after the afternoon Tamid?
3. At what point in the korban process does the meat become permitted to the kohanim for consumption?
4. Explain the concept of שלא לשמה as it applies to korbanos.

ance with Tosafos' opinion. This is because technically, according to Tosafos, the order of the Chatas/Olah will not prevent atonement. (see the Maharsham there for other reasons as well). ■

1. הריטב"א בקידושין י"ג, הובא במל"מ בהלכות תמידין ומוספין פ"ט ה"ו. [ואפשר שכן דעת רש"י כאן עי' ברש"י כאן בע"ב בד"ה והעלה, ובעמוד א' בד"ה זה בנה אב ודו"ק.]
2. כאן בתוד"ה זה. שביארו שבכל החטאות פשיטא שאינו מעכב. ורק בחטאת מצורה קס"ד דמעכב ממש"כ בן, "תהיה" וקמ"ל שאפילו בחטאת דמצורה ג"כ לא מעכב. וכן עי' בתוס' בקידושין י"ג א' בד"ה האשה, ובתוס' בזבחים ה' ע"א
3. המ"ב בסימן א' ס"ק ט"ו
4. המהרש"ם בספרו דעת תורה בעו"ח בסימן א' ס"ה ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

### Lighting the lamp of faith

בעידן דמדלקת נרות תהא מקטרא קטרת...

The Shem Mi'Shmuel, zt"l, teaches that material reality reflects spiritual reality. The nighttime represents situations and times that are challenging, when everything is dark and unclear, and danger lurks everywhere. It is at just such times that we stand most in need of a beacon to light our path and keep us going. The Menorah is just such a lodestar; it broadcasts the glow and warmth of spiritual vitality out into the oncoming night to guide and

strengthen us. It radiates with Hashem's light.

We find on today's daf that the incense must already be burning when the Menorah is lit. The Zohar HaKadosh explains that ketores is Aramaic for keshet, or connection. As night descends, the first step is to bind ourselves to Hashem. No matter what we go through, we remain determined to strive to be connected. Once the connection is fast, we illuminate the darkness with the pure light of faith in Hashem—this is the lighting of the Menorah itself.

HaRav Yechezkel Abramsky, zt"l, was exiled to Siberia in his youth, bereft of tefillin, Torah, and the oppor-

tunity to do mitzvos. Every day, he would wake up and say modeh ani and wonder, "What kind of day awaits me? A day of slave labor, beatings, and humiliation. If I could only learn, it would all be worthwhile. But even that is beyond my reach. What do I have to be grateful for?" When he would reach the words, "rabbah emunasecha," however, he could feel new life start to spread through his limbs. "How great is Your faith! My emunah in You is the one thing that no one has the power to take from me! Modeh ani! It's worth living another day for this alone! A day of Siberian exile is beyond price—because emunah makes any life worthwhile!" ■