

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The olah of a private bamah

R' Zeira inquires about the status of an olah of a private bamah that was brought into the domain of the communal bamah and then taken out again.

Initially the Gemara assumes that this issue is subject to the dispute between Rabbah and R' Yosef.

The Gemara explains how this question is relevant according to both opinions.

The inquiry is left unresolved.

It is noted that R' Yannai was uncertain about whether the halacha follows Rabbah's position or R' Yosef's position.

After the Gemara further qualifies R' Yannai's inquiry it is left unresolved.

2) Nighttime slaughter at a private bamah

Rav and Shmuel disagree about the status of a nighttime slaughter at a private bamah.

It is noted that this disagreement relates to a contradiction raised by R' Elazar.

3) The olah of a private bamah

Rav and R' Yochanan disagree whether skinning and dismemberment is required for an olah offered on a private bamah.

It is noted that this disagreement relates to a statement of R' Yosi HaGalili.

A Baraisa is cited in support of R' Yochanan's position

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between Rabbah and R' Yosef?

2. Is it allowed to slaughter a korban that is to be brought on a private bamah at night?

3. What is the point of dispute between Rav and R' Yochanan?

4. What is the source that nosar applies to korbanos brought on a private bamah?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 By Mr. and Mrs. Ronny Shabat
 In loving memory of their brother
 ר' יהודה דוד בן ר' שאול, ע"ה

Distinctive INSIGHT

Blemishes and time limits for the Altar and a private bamah

מומין וזמן בגדולה וקטנה

Rav and R' Yochanan disagreed whether an olah brought on a private bamah needed to undergo הפשט and ניתוח, skinning and being cut up into pieces before being placed on the altar. Rav's opinion is that this is only necessary for an olah on the Altar in the Mikdash, but not on a private altar. R' Yochanan contends that skinning and cutting up is also necessary for an olah offering brought on a private altar.

A Baraisa is cited wherein we find a support for the opinion of R' Yochanan. The Baraisa compares the procedures for the service in the Mikdash and that of a private bamah, and it lists the areas they shared in common and those which were different. Among the procedures which the Baraisa lists that they share is skinning and cutting up. The Baraisa concludes by pointing out that the laws of blemishes which disqualify one from being allowed to officiate are shared, just as the rules regarding the time limits for consumption of the various offerings are shared between the Mikdash and a private bamah.

Rashi explains that the source for the disqualification of a person with a blemish to serve at a private bamah is learned from the Torah's not mentioning anything in this regard. If the Torah would allow a person with a blemish to serve, we would have found some reference in a verse specifically to permit it. Rashash explains that Rashi's comments are only said in reference to the blemishes of the kohen, or even the non-kohen who officiates at a private bamah. However, we do find an explicit Gemara in Bechoros (14b) which provides the verses from where we learn the disqualification of a blemished animal to be brought as an offering on a private bamah.

Keren Orah notes that the Gemara earlier (115b) said that a non-Jew may bring a blemished animal as an offering on a bamah. This indicates that before the building of the Mishkan, service on a bamah by a ben-Noach included even blemished animals. Keren Orah asks why is it that during the periods that a bamah was permitted in Eretz Yisroel that a Jew could not offer a blemished animal? Why is the rule different than it is for a ben-Noach whose service is, by definition, at a bamah?

He answers that the Torah's mitzvah for a Jew to serve without a blemish, and to bring only complete animals applies even where a Jew brings an offering for the sake of a non-Jew. This mitzvah was not issued to non-Jews, and their status remains as it was before the building of the Mishkan. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Reciting a beracha when there is a concern that the mitzvah will not be fulfilled

מר משני כאן בחולין וכו'

One master answers that one case refers to non-sacred animals etc.

The Gemara teaches that it is permitted to slaughter animals and birds at night. The Gemara Chullin (13b) limits this ruling to slaughtering by the light of a torch but it is prohibited, l'chatchila, to slaughter at night without a lit torch out of fear that one may make an error while slaughtering and not realize it. Yerushalmi (Berachos 9:3) presents a disagreement when one should recite the beracha when slaughtering an animal. R' Yochanan maintains that the beracha should be recited before slaughtering, as is done by all other mitzvos where the beracha is recited before performing the mitzvah. Yosi ben Nehorai disagrees and contends that the beracha is recited after slaughtering since there is a chance that the slaughter will be done improperly and it would turn out that the beracha was recited and the mitzvah was not performed. Shulchan Aruch¹ rules in accordance with R' Yochanan that the beracha is recited before slaughtering without concern for the possibility that something may go wrong while slaughtering, since the slaughterer is assumed to be proficient at this task.

There is a disagreement regarding when birchas eirusin should be recited. Rambam² rules that the beracha should be recited before the kiddushin, similar to all other mitzvos where the beracha is recited before performing the mitzvah. If

(Overview...continued from page 1)

that skinning and dismemberment is required.

4) Nosar for a korban brought on a private bamah

A Baraisa presents the source that the normal timeframe for consuming korbanos applies even for korbanos brought on a private bamah. ■

הדרן עלך פרת חטאת
וסליקא לה מסכת זבחים

■ ■ ■

the beracha is recited after the kiddushin was performed it is a beracha recited in vain. Ra'avad³ disagrees and contends that one should perform the kiddushin and then the beracha should be recited. The mitzvah of kiddushin is different than slaughtering for the following reason. When it comes to slaughtering, the slaughterer is assumed to be proficient and thus there is no reason to be concerned that the mitzvah will not be performed properly. Kiddushin, however, involves another party, and if the woman has a sudden change of heart and rejects the kiddushin it would turn out that the beracha was recited in vain. Shulchan Aruch⁴ rules that l'chatchila one should recite the beracha before kiddushin but Chelkas M'chokeik⁵ adds that if the beracha was not recited before the kiddushin it may be recited after the kiddushin. ■

1. שו"ע יו"ד סי' י"א סעי' א'.
2. רמב"ם פ"ג מהל' אישות הכ"ג.
3. ראב"ד שם.
4. שו"ע אה"ע סי' ל"ד סעי' א'.
5. חלקת מחוקק שם סק"ג. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Dissecting the Olah

"אין טעונה הפשט וניתוח..."

The Tiferes Yechezkel, זת"ל, gave a very inspiring lesson how to attain humility in avodas Hashem.

He said, "Rav Levi learns from the korban olah that one who is arrogant is judged with fire. As the verse states, 'היא העולה על מוקדה'." We can understand this in light of how the Magid of Zlotchov, זת"ל, illustrated how to better one's character through the halachos of olah. The verse states, 'והפשיט את העולה'. Literally this means that he shall skin the olah, but the Magid explains

that olah can also refer to where one feels he has advanced. When he believes that he has ascended in a certain area he must act out the continuation of the verse, 'ונתח את נתחיה'. Literally this means that it should be cut into pieces. In terms of avodah one is advised to analyze deeply all of his good attributes. If he is honest he will see that although he certainly is endowed with positive achievements, they are still very far from perfection. He will discern that his advantages are not what they had at first appeared."

He explained further, "The gemara in Shabbos teaches when the Jewish people stood on Har Sinai פסקה זהומתן — the filth injected in them from the sin of Adam was removed. The Midrash adds

that after we said נעשה ונשמע, the yetzer hara was uprooted from our hearts. In light of this we can understand Rabi Yosi's statement in Zevachim 120 that the olah that the Jewish people offered in the desert prior to the construction of the Mishkan did not require skinning or nituach since these requirements began only later. As long as the yetzer remained completely uprooted we had no need to work on arrogance by dissecting every good deed to see where it was still incomplete. It was only after the sin of the golden calf that the yetzer returned and we built the Mishkan that we required such self-introspection to counteract our conceit."² ■

1. ויקרא רבה, ז' ו'.
2. תפארת יחזקאל, ח"ב, ע' י"ג. ■