



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Pigeons and turtledoves (cont.)

The Gemara refutes Rava's attempt to resolve R' Zeira's inquiry about one who vowed to bring either a turtledove or pigeon and then one of each in the in between stage.

2) Palgas

R' Zeira inquires about one who vowed to bring a ram or a lamb and instead brought a palgas (the intermediate stage between a lamb and a ram).

The Gemara explains that the question is limited to Bar Pada's position rather than R' Yochanan and then leaves the matter unresolved.

3) Sei'ur

R' Zeira inquires about one who vowed to bring ten todah loaves from chometz or matzah and brought instead sei'ur (dough between the unleavened and leavened state).

The Gemara explains that the question is limited to R' Yehudah's position regarding sei'ur rather than R' Meir's understanding of sei'ur.

The Gemara unsuccessfully challenges the possibility that offering sei'ur would satisfy one's vow.

The question is left unresolved.

4) **MISHNAH:** The Gemara contrasts the slaughter of the parah adumah with the eglah arufah.

5) Clarifying the Mishnah

A Beraisa further elaborates on the difference between the slaughter of the parah adumah and the eglah arufah.

The Gemara begins to formulate a kal vachomer that would teach that it should be acceptable to kill a parah adumah with arifah. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What does the term השחתה connote?
.....
2. What is a פלגס?
.....
3. What is the point of dispute between R' Meir and R' Yehudah concerning שיאור?
.....
4. What is the difference between the manner in which a parah adumah is killed and the eglah arufah is killed?
.....

Distinctive INSIGHT

Sei'ur—a condition of dough as it begins to ferment

בעי רב זירא האומר הרי עלי לחמי תודה מן החמץ או מן המצה והביא שיאור מהו? שיאור דמאן?

R' Zeira presents an inquiry, and in order to analyze it we need a short introduction. A todah offering is brought with four types of loaves, each made into ten loaves, for a total of forty loaves. Three of them are types of matzah loaves, and the fourth is chametz. We also note that if one eats a k'zayis of chametz on Pesach he is liable for kareis. When dough begins to ferment the process renders the dough inedible until the fermentation is completed and the dough is leavened. The Mishnah refers to dough during this process as שיאור. The Tannaim disagree when the dough is in this stage precisely, and they also disagree regarding the punishment for one who eats it. R' Meir holds that as soon as the surface of the dough begins to pale and darken it is no longer matzah, and one who eats it is liable for lashes. As it continues to ferment, the surface develops small cracks the size of insect antenna. At this point R' Meir holds that it is chametz, and one who eats it is liable for kareis.

R' Yehuda says that as long as the surface of the dough is dark it is still matzah, but the rabbis prohibited it to be eaten. When it develops cracks it becomes שיאור. At this point it must be burned, but one who eats it is still not liable for kareis.

R' Zeira discusses a case where someone promised that he would bring ten loaves of a todah, either from chametz or from matzah. He then brought ten loaves of שיאור. Has he fulfilled his obligation, and to what degree? The Gemara notes that we must clarify the stage of fermenting dough he brought and according to whom is this question directed. If he brought darkening dough, which is שיאור according to R' Meir, this is considered as chametz, as we find that one is liable for lashes if he eats it. Rather, the question is where a person brought dough with a cracking surface, and according to R' Yehuda its status is doubtful. Rashi notes that R' Yehuda holds that eating this dough is not liable, which indicates that is not genuine chametz. Yet, it must be burned, so it is not bona-fide matzah either.

Chazon Ish explains that the inquiry of R' Zeira is an attempt to understand the view of R' Yehuda. Perhaps this

Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mr. and Mrs. Michael Schultz in memory of their father
ר' יונה בן ר' מנשה לייב הכהן ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mr. & Mrs. Dennis Ruben in memory of their parents
ר' אברהם וואלף בן ר' בערל ז"ל
ר' חיים שלום בן ר' בנדיט מאיר ז"ל

HALACHAH Highlight

The *palgas*

והביא פלגס מהו

And he offered a *palgas* what is the halacha?

The Gemara presents a disagreement between R' Yochanan and Bar Padda concerning a *palgas*. A *palgas* is an animal which is between a lamb and a ram. It is either a ram or a lamb, or it is its own species, neither a ram or a lamb. During the first year of its life the species is called a lamb. Once it is even an hour into the second year it is no longer a lamb and may not be used for any offering that requires a lamb. A ram is the term used for the species when the animal is more than thirty days into its second year. When the animal is more than a year but not yet one year and thirty days it is a *palgas*. R' Yochanan maintains that a *palgas* is an independent stage of maturation and is neither a lamb nor a ram. According to Bar Padda we do not know how to categorize the *palgas*. It is either a lamb or a ram but we do not know which. One practical difference between offering a lamb and offering a ram is the quantity of wine, flour and oil that will accompany its offering as its libation. The Mishnah in Parah (1:3) teaches that when offering a *palgas* one should offer with it the libations of a ram. It is understood¹ that when offering this libation one must make the stipulation that if the *palgas* is a ram then the entire libation is offered in fulfillment of that obligation, but if the *palgas* is a lamb then the extra quantities are being offered on a voluntary basis. Additionally, the Gemara inquires whether Bar Padda also entertains the possibility that the *palgas* may be an intermedi-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

שיאור is not chametz, and the need to burn it is rabbinic. Chazon Ish notes that the Mishnah in Pesachim (48b) states that one who eats *שיאור* is exempt, but that it must be burned. The definition of this stage of fermentation must be understood according to R' Meir as well as according to R' Yehuda. Yet, the Gemara realized that according to R' Meir it is certainly not chametz, and the requirement to burn it is rabbinic. R' Yehuda is more lenient. Although R' Meir prohibits it, R' Yehuda permits darkening dough for benefit. If R' Yehuda holds that *שיאור* is not chametz, he should allow his own *sei'ur* for benefit, but this is not the case. ■

ate stage and one would also have to stipulate the possibility that the entire libation is a voluntary offering.

Rambam² writes regarding this case that one who offers a *palgas* when he vowed to bring either a lamb or a ram that it is uncertain whether he has fulfilled his vow. Lechem Mishnah³ notes that although according to R' Yochanan there is no uncertainty whatsoever, nevertheless, since the Gemara explains that R' Zeira's question was relevant only according to Bar Padda, that indicates that the halacha follows his position. He does note a difficulty with Rambam's position. Rambam⁴ rules that one who offers a *palgas* must offer it with the libations that accompany a ram and he does not mention anything about the necessary stipulation that should be made when offering the libation and he leaves that question unresolved. ■

1. רש"י ד"ה מיייתי ומתני.
2. רמב"ם פט"ז מהלי מעשה קרבנות ה"ב.
3. לחם משנה שם.
4. רמב"ם שם פ"ב ה"ו. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Idol upon the Water

ועבודת כוכבים דכתיב פן תשחיתון ועשיתם לכם פסל

On today's daf we find that the term *השחיתה*, destruction, refers to *avodah zarah*.

Rav Yitzchak Shlomo Ungvar, zt"l, the Gaon Av Beis Din of Chug Chasam Sofer, lived through the Holocaust through open miracles.

During Purim תש"ל he became very joyous and recounted a miracle that he

experienced due to his refusal to do anything which appeared to be idol worship. He began to dance and cried, "Ribono Shel Olam! Even if they take me and cut my flesh into little pieces my emunah will not falter!"

He then recounted the miracle. "The Nazis took their prisoners on long and arduous marches that lasted for many days. They watched over the prisoners to ensure that none escaped. The sun beat down upon us and we were hungry and thirsty. We were given no water until we reached a certain stream. There the Nazis allowed the weary prisoners to drink. Without the refreshing drink, it is un-

likely that we could have survived.

"As I approached the stream I noticed that an idol had been placed over it. I also knew that the Shulchan Aruch forbids one to bend over to drink from water with an idol over it so I did not join my fellow prisoners.

"One of the guards approached me and said, 'I know why you are not drinking with the rest.' To my shock he went over to the stream and dipped in a vessel to allow me to drink the life-giving water. To me this virtually unique experience was a sign that Hashem was with me!"¹ ■

1. מעיינות אש, תמוז תשס"ד, ע"מ מ"ב