

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Communal Shelamim

A Baraisa presents an exposition that teaches that a communal Shelamim must be slaughtered and the blood received to the north.

Rava challenges this derivation and suggests an alternative source.

Numerous challenges against this exposition are presented and the last one remains unresolved.

The Gemara then suggests a possible resolution to this challenge as well.

**2) MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the procedure for the Todah and Nazir's Ram which are in the kodoshim kalim category.

### 3) Kodoshim kalim

A Baraisa is cited to demonstrate that kodoshim kalim may be eaten anywhere in Yerushalayim.

This exposition is challenged.

Abaye and Rava offer different resolutions to this challenge.

Rava's answer is successfully challenged and the Gemara declares that Abaye's answer is more reasonable.

**4) MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the procedure for the Shelamim.

### 5) Shelamim

A Baraisa presents expositions of two different Tannaim that teaches that the Shelamim may be slaughtered anywhere in the courtyard.

The Gemara explains the point of dispute between these two Tannaim.

**6) Slaughtering the Shelamim with the Sanctuary doors closed**

Tangentially, R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel derives a halacha from the fact that one verse uses the term פתח אהל מועד – the entrance to the Ohel Moed – and another verse uses the phrase לפני אהל מועד – in front of the Ohel Moed.

Additional teachings related to this issue are recorded.

Inquiries related to this issue are discussed. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*The mitzvah to eat from the meat of the offerings*

כלל אדם בכל מאכל ליום ולילה עד חצות

Rambam writes (Sefer HaMitzvos, Positive Command 89) that there is no specific mitzvah to eat from the offerings which are kodoshim kalim—those which are of a lower level of holiness. The only command we find is in Shemos (29:33), “they shall eat of that through which they are atoned,” and this verse is written regarding the more intense level of sanctified offerings, from which the kohanim eat and whereby the owners attain their atonement. There is no specific mitzvah to eat Kodoshim Kalim, and the atonement for the owner is not dependent upon these offerings. Nevertheless, eating from Kodoshim Kalim is an extension of this mitzvah.

Rambam does not explain, however, if this extension is only when the kohanim eat from the portion which is given to them from the offering, or if it applies also to the portion eaten by the owners.

Rashi in Pesachim (59a) comments on the verse from Shemos (ibid.) and he clearly says that the positive mitzvah to eat from an offering applies to the kohanim as well as to the owners. ח"ד points out that this is also the view of Tosafos (97b, ד"ה ייתי).

Ramban also contends that the mitzvah of eating the meat of an offering applies to the owners, and he cites the verse in Devarim (14:23) which states, “And you shall eat before God, in the place He has chosen to reside, the tithes of your grain, wine and oil, the first born of your cattle and livestock, etc.” We see that the Torah specifically includes the non-kohen in the mitzvah of eating from the offerings.

Minchas Chinuch (Mitzvah 102: #1) notes that this issue seems to be the subject of a disagreement among the

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the source that kodoshim kalim may be eaten anywhere in Yerushalayim?
2. Where are kodoshim kalim supposed to be slaughtered?
3. Why does the Torah state ושחטו פתח אהל מועד?
4. Was it allowed to slaughter a Shelamim while the Levi'im were erecting the Mishkan?

## HALACHAH Highlight

### Seclusion behind an unlocked, closed door

פשיטא מוגף כנעול דמי

*It is obvious that closed doors are the same as locked doors*

Rashba<sup>1</sup> writes that it is not considered yichud – seclusion, if a man and woman are in room with the door closed if the door is not locked. The reason is that as long as the door is not locked there is the fear that someone from the outside could enter at any time and that concern prevents anything inappropriate from taking place. Rav Akiva Eiger<sup>2</sup> cites Beis Meir who maintains that there is an error in the writings of Rashba. What it should say is that a man and woman behind a closed door is not enough of a foundation (it should say the word יסוד rather than יחוד) to prohibit a woman on her husband unless the door is locked. In other words, it is prohibited for a man and woman to be in seclusion behind a closed door but a woman does not become prohibited to her husband unless the door was locked as well.

Maharsham<sup>3</sup> suggests that the discussion in our Gemara has bearing on this disagreement. The Gemara relates that it is prohibited to slaughter korbanos if the doors to the Heichal are closed even if they are not locked. The reason given by the Gemara is that closed doors are the same as locked doors. This seemingly establishes a general principle that for halachic matters a closed door is the same as a locked door. He then suggests that a parallel cannot be drawn between the two cases. It is possible that for matters of seclusion a closed door is not equivalent to a locked door and even contends<sup>4</sup> that the suggested emendation to the wording of Rashba is difficult to ac-

*(Insight...continued from page 1)*

Rishonim. The Gemara in Nedarim (4b) teaches that there is a mitzvah for women to eat from the meat of offerings. Rosh explains that the source of this halacha is the verse in Shemos (29:33), which was cited by Rambam, above. Rosh notes that eating from the portions of the offering also helps to avoid the prohibition of leaving the meat beyond its time limit (nosar). It is evident that Rosh here is referring to Kodoshim Kalim, as Kodshei Kodoshim are only eaten by male kohanim. We do see, however, that Rosh holds that there is a mitzvah for the owners of the offering to eat. We do note, though, that the verse he cites as the source is not the same verse brought by Ramban.

In that same discussion, Ran writes that the comment of the Gemara for women, or any owners, to eat from an offering is only referring to eating from the Pesach, but not to offerings at large.

It is of interest to note that Rashi to Sanhedrin (70b, ד"ה (לא תוויי seems to agree with Ran, and that the mitzvah to eat is only regarding the Pesach. Kli Chemda (Bamidbar, p. 102) discusses this inconsistency in the comments of Rashi. ■

cept. Teshuvos Binyan Tzion<sup>5</sup> writes that every circumstance has to be judged on its own merits. In a circumstance where the door is unlocked and it is likely that people will enter the room it is not considered seclusion but in those circumstances in which it is not likely that people will enter if the door is closed it is considered seclusion. ■

1. שו"ת הרשב"א ח"א סי' אלף רנ"א.
2. שו"ת רעק"א מהדו"ק סי' ק'.
3. שו"ת מהרש"ם ח"ב סי' ע"ו.
4. מהרש"ם שם במפתחות.
5. שו"ת בנין ציון סי' קל"ח. ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

### The Olah and the Shelamim

"שלמים קדשים קלים..."

It was motzei Shabbos and Rav Yosef Dov Soleveitchik, zt"l, needed a minyan for ma'ariv. He wandered into a Modzhitzer shtiebl where, despite the lateness of the hour, the chassidim were singing with intense dveikus. After waiting a time he asked when they would daven ma'ariv. "What, you want to bring in the week already?" was the indignant reply.

The Modzhitzer chassidim worked

hard for their livelihood often with physical labor, as water carriers and the like. It would certainly be fair to wonder where they got the strength to be so involved in spirituality despite their heavy involvement in materialism the entire week. The following words of the Divrei Yisrael of Modzhitz, zt"l, sheds light on the question. "The olah offering represents Torah and prayer, as we can learn from Menachos 110. It is kodshei kodoshim, unlike the shelamim which is kodoshim kalim and alludes to making a living. Through this we can understand the Mishnah in Zevachim 55. Shelamim are kodoshim kalim and their blood must be applied in a double application that is

really four. The word damim, blood, can also refer to money. One must work and make money to enable him to learn Torah and daven, both of which are double-fold. Torah is doubled because there are two elements to Torah—written and oral—and they each contain both positive and negative mitzvos. Prayer is also doubled since we daven day and night. These are the two applications that are four to which we must apply our money.

"We must know that the time we spend learning and davening does not cause us a financial loss. Because the purpose of working is to learn and daven!"<sup>1</sup> ■

1. דברי ישראל, פרשת צו. ■