



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

R' Amram continues to analyze R' Yochanan's qualification to the Baraisa's ruling regarding the offering of a surplus todah.

The Gemara spells out what R' Amram accomplished with his analysis.

It is reported that Abaye analyzed R' Yochanan's ruling in the same manner as R' Amram.

Further support for this is recorded.

Shmuel states that in cases in which a chattas would be left to die, a todah is brought without loaves and in cases in which a chattas would be left to graze, the todah requires bread.

Shmuel's statement is unsuccessfully challenged.

The response to the first challenge is refuted and an alternative response is presented.

This response is unsuccessfully challenged.

2) The animal and bread of a todah

R' Abba discusses whether either part of the todah that becomes lost could be replaced.

Rava discusses whether extra money for one part of the todah may be used for the other part of the todah.

The reasoning behind this ruling is explained.

Rava and Abaye disagree about a circumstance in which one has three todos to offer for a single obligation.

R' Zeira reports that a similar discussion can be found

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. According to Shmuel, how do we decide whether a surplus todah is to be accompanied by loaves?

2. Why are the loaves of a todah replaceable but not the animal of a todah?

3. What is the point of dispute between Rava and Abaye?

4. What was R' Chiya's teaching that faced numerous challenges?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 לע"נ מרת רבקה בת ר' שרגא פאטעל ע"ה
 By her children
 Mr. and Mrs. David Friedman

Distinctive INSIGHT

Designating two animals for a chattas obligation

הפריש שתי חטאות לאחריות מתכפר באיזה שירצה והשניה תרעה

The Gemara presents a comment of R' Oshaya who discusses the case of a person who is obligated to bring a chattas offering. The person sets aside two animals, one as the chattas and the other as a back-up, just in case the first one gets lost. The halacha of R' Oshaya is that this person may bring either one of the animals as his chattas, and the other animal must be left to graze until it develops a blemish.

Tosafos points out that this scenario is problematic, because the Gemara in Nedarim (6a) teaches that a person does not designate an animal for a chattas unless he is obligated to do so. Once this person sets aside one animal for his obligation, how can he again designate a second animal just as a replacement for the first one? What would be the significance of this sort of consecration of an animal for a non-existent chattas obligation?

Tosafos also notes that even if the two animals were consecrated simultaneously it would not be effective, because we have a rule (Kiddushin 50b) that any designation that cannot be done sequentially may also not be done simultaneously.

Tosafos concludes that the case must be where the person takes two animals and he makes a condition and states that he is consecrating only one of the two. Keren Orah points out that according to Tosafos, it should be that only the one which is used for a chattas is actually consecrated, and the other should not need to be left to pasture until it develops a blemish, or, according to R' Shimon, that it be left to die.

Chazon Ish (Kodoshim 21:#10) explains that Tosafos means to say that the person does not mean that only one of the animals will be for an offering and not the other, but rather that he is consecrating them both on the condition that only one will be brought for the chattas. This conditional type of declaration does result in the second animal's having some sort of consecration, to the extent that it must be left to graze.

Tosafos in Pesachim (97b) also deals with this question, and there Tosafos explains that the designation of the second animal is valid because it was done as a guarantee of sorts, that if anything were to happen to the first animal, this one would be used to replace it. Although we questioned the validity of such a designation, R"י explains that the halacha is that this process is valid at least to the extent that if the first animal is actually used, the second must be left to pasture until it develops a blemish. Tosafos Yeshanim in Yoma (65a) clearly states that a person may designate even several animals as "guarantees" as replacements for an offering he is planning to bring. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 By Mr. Melech Bernstein and family
 in loving memory of our father
 ר' אליעזר יחזקאל בן ר' לוי, ע"ה

HALACHAH Highlight

Bringing non-sacred items into the courtyard

תודה שנתערבה בתמורתה

A Todah that became intermingled with its exchange

The Gemara discusses the circumstance of a todah and its exchange (תמורה) that became intermingled and then one of the two animals died. The Gemara states that the remaining animal should be left to graze until it develops a blemish since it is not known whether the remaining animal should be brought in conjunction with the todah loaves or not. Rabbi was asked why the loaves cannot be brought with the following stipulation. If the remaining animal is the todah these are its loaves and if the remaining animal is the exchange the loaves will remain unconsecrated. Rabbi answered that this approach is not an option since it is prohibited to bring unconsecrated items into the courtyard. Rashi¹ explains that the prohibition against bringing unconsecrated items into the courtyard applies to any unconsecrated item.

Tosafos² questions this position from the mere fact that people enter the courtyard wearing their clothes which are unconsecrated. Additionally, the Gemara Pesachim (66b) relates that Hillel the Elder would bring his Korban Pesach into the courtyard before it was sanctified and would orally sanctify it in the courtyard. According to Rashi, however, that practice was prohibited. Tosafos therefore explains that the prohibition against bringing unconsecrated items into the courtyard is

related to a chattas.

The reason R' Zeira had to point out that the cases are similar is explained.

3) A Todah and its temurah

R' Chiya cites a Baraisa that teaches that if a todah and temurah become intermingled and then one of them dies there is nothing that could be done with the one that remains.

The exact circumstances of the case are clarified.

Three possible resolutions to this circumstance are presented to Rabbi and he rejects them all. ■

limited to items that will be used in a form of service of the Beis HaMikdash. For example, in our case if one waved the todah loaves and it turns out that the animal that remained was not the todah the loaves that were used in the service of the Beis HaMikdash were not sacred. There is no prohibition against bringing non-sacred items that are not used for the service of the Beis HaMikdash. Tosafos in Chullin³ points out that it is evident from our Gemara that the prohibition against bringing non-sacred items into the Beis HaMikdash is Biblical. If this was not the case and the restriction was Rabbinic in origin, the restriction would be set aside for the purpose of bringing a korban. The fact that it cannot be set aside indicates that the restriction is Biblical. ■

1. רש"י פ"א. ד"ה ולייתי.

2. תוס' ד"ה וכי.

3. תוס' חולין ק"ל: ד"ה אי. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Words of the Wise

"כמדומה שאין לו מוח בקדקדו"

A certain man once asked the Chavos Yair, ז"ל, about a surprising comment found on today's daf. "In many places we find various insults various luminaries hurled at each other. For example, in Menachos 80 we find that Rabbi tells Levi, 'I don't believe he has a brain in his head...' How could he say such a sharp insult? Isn't that a little harsh? What about the verse, 'דברי חכמים בנחת נשמעים' — the words of the wise, spoken gently, are heard?" And the Mishnah: 'יהי כבוד חברך חביב עליך כשלך' — The honor of your friend should be

as dear to you as your own!"

The Chavos Yair responded, "It was from here that the Rambam learned that a rav must show anger with his disciple if he feels that the student's failure to understand is due to a lack of diligence and care in his learning. Since Rabbi felt that his student was careless, showing anger was a means to goad him to be more diligent in the future."

When Rav Eliezer Schlesinger, ז"ל, was asked to explain this he made a strong point. "It is true that Rabbi insulted Rav Levi. Yet you must consider that this is the best way to develop his student. It is important to note that we also find Rabbi complimenting Levi, for example, in Zevachim 30. Surely this was done in a properly balanced manner to educate Rav Levi in the best possible

way."¹

When Rav Aharon Kotler, ז"ל, was asked about this he replied with passion, as was his wont. "Chas v'shalom that you should think that Rabbi said this with the intention of insulting Rav Levi! Every word they spoke was with great brevity, even while teaching their students. And they never wasted a word in their lives.

"Rabbi spoke with such force to teach Levi that his sevarah was absolutely incorrect. Levi asked one thing. Rabbi replied that even more than his question was obvious. This is a Torah lesson which Levi required: that the sevarah on which question was based should be rejected."² ■

1. ספר יד אליהו

2. משנת רבי אהרן ■