

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

Abaye further limits the Mishnah's ruling that flour designated for a mincha placed in one utensil but then placed in another utensil is invalid to where he designated a specific type at the time of his vow. But if the designation was done when he set aside the flour it does not become invalidated.

Another teaching is cited that supports this distinction.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses when one stipulates invalid criteria about his voluntary mincha.

3) Clarifying Tanna Kamma's position

Chizkiya asserts that Tanna Kamma follows Beis Sham-mai's opinion that we hold a person to his first statement.

R' Yochanan explains how the Mishnah could be explained even according to Beis Hillel.

Chizkiya asserts that Tanna Kamma's ruling is limited to where the person referenced barley, but would not apply if he referenced beans.

It is noted that this qualification is inconsistent with Chizkiya's earlier explanation.

The Gemara answers that Chizkiya retracted his earlier explanation and the reason why he retracted his earlier explanation is clarified.

R' Yochanan asserts that according to Tanna Kamma the same halacha would be true if the person referenced beans rather than barley.

It is noted that this understanding of Tanna Kamma is inconsistent with R' Yochanan's earlier explanation.

The Gemara answers that R' Yochanan's second statement was merely a response to Chizkiya's position and does not reflect his understanding of Tanna Kamma.

Zeiri qualifies Tanna Kamma's ruling.

Numerous unsuccessful challenges to this qualification are presented.

At the end of the discussion Rava teaches that R' Shimon follows R' Yosi's position that a person is bound also by the conclusion of his statement.

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents a discussion why a person cannot offer more than sixty esronim at a single time.

5) Clarifying the Mishnah

A Baraisa records a more detailed account of the debate presented in the Mishnah.

R' Zeira clarifies a point regarding R' Shimon's position.

6) The tum'ah of blood from a neveilah

R' Bibi in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Levi reported that they once measured the blood of a dead mule to see if it was a rev'i's to determine if it was tamei.

R' Yitzchok bar Bisna challenges this practice since blood of a neveilah is tahor, and R' Bibi was silenced.

R' Zereikah suggested a possible response. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

The measurements and limits determined by our sages

אמרו להם כל מדות חכמים כן הוא

The Mishnah limit a maximum of sixty esronim of flour that may be brought as a minchah in one vessel. One who offers a minchah of sixty-one esronim may only bring up to sixty in one container, and the other one would have to be brought in a second vessel. Rabbi Shimon explained that this is based upon the verse (Vayikra 7:10), where the Torah says that a minchah must maintain a proportion of flour and oil so that the oil can be absorbed properly in the flour. When more than sixty esronim is brought in one container, the oil cannot be absorbed properly.

The students asked R' Shimon why sixty is the cut-off for this effect. Is it correct that sixty esronim can absorb oil, but sixty-one suddenly is incapable of absorbing oil? In response to this question, R' Shimon responded that all limits of our sages, regarding measures and sizes, are exact. They are precise and definitive. For example, the volume of water for immersion in a mikveh is 40 kav, which is 960 log. Even if a mikveh is depleted by a trace amount (a kortov, which is 1/64 of a log), the mikveh would be inadequate for immersion, as it would be deficient

Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between Tanna Kamma and R' Shimon?
2. How do Chizkiya and R' Yochanan differ in their explanation of Tanna Kamma?
3. What is the point of dispute between Tanna Kamma and R' Shimon concerning the largest size mincha that one may offer?
4. Explain כל הראוי לביילה אין בילה מעכבת בו.

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mr. and Mrs. Jonah Bruck
In loving memory of their grandfather
ר' משה מאיר בן ר' ישעיהו יצחק, ע"ה
Mr. Mike Garber o.b.m.

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mrs. Sheila Liberman
In memory of her father
ר' חיים בן ר' שמעון הלוי, ע"ה

HALACHAH Highlight

Declaring a lamb to be one's Korban Pesach in our times

שלא התנדב כדרך המתנדבין

Because he did not donate in the manner of those who donate

There was once a young man who had a baby lamb in his flock and one day he declared to his uncle regarding this lamb, "This is my Korban Pesach." When the local head of the beis din heard about this he was stunned. When he later interviewed the young man it was evident that the child knew nothing about matters of sanctity and his declaration was not serious. Nevertheless, due to the potential severity involved the head of the beis din decided that he would consult with Chasam Sofer about the matter¹. His analysis began with our Mishnah which teaches that if a person vows to bring a korban in a manner which it is not normally brought, e.g. to offer a mincha made from barley, he is exempt from having to bring a korban. The reason is that "he did not donate in the manner of those who donate." The Gemara in Peachim (53b) teaches further that according to R' Shimon when one vows to bring an animal as a korban nowadays the animal does not become sanctified since this is also not considered to be the way that people vow to bring korbanos, since people do not bring korbanos without the Beis HaMikdash. For this reason, explains Chok Yaakov², Rambam does not mention the prohibition against declaring nowadays "this meat is for Pesach" lest one think that the declarer sanctified the meat since Rambam rules in accordance with R' Shimon and such a declaration is not binding.

Chasam Sofer asserts that only objects sanctified for Beis HaMikdash upkeep (בדק הבית) do not take effect in our times but items that could be brought as korbanos do become sanctified if one makes an explicit vow in that regard since Rambam

(Insight...continued from page 1)

and invalid.

Sefer Poras Yosef (to Rosh HaShana 13a) notes that in several places (Sukka 5b, Eiruvin 4a) the Gemara informs us that the measures and volumes established in the Gemara are given to us as Halachos from Moshe at Sinai, but our Mishnah reports that these measures are from the sages. What is the precise nature of these measures? He answers that measurements which are used to determine punishments are Halachos from Moshe at Sinai. For example, this includes determination of the size of a k'zayis for eating of forbidden foods. The sages, however, are the ones who fixed the measurements for non-punishment cases, such as forty se'ah of water for a mikveh and the size of an egg for impurity of food, which are the items listed in our Gemara.

The commentators explain these measurements using two approaches. Some say that when it was necessary to establish a limit, the sages sat and carefully analyzed and researched a matter until they determined the precise measurement for a particular issue. If anyone would later come and question it, we would say that the matter is already settled, and alternative suggestions are erroneous. Others say that the sages made decisions which were mostly precise, but occasionally approximate. However, the rule is now that their decision is final and immutable. Rashi (Kesuvos 104a) and Rashba (Bava Basra 29a) seem to explain according to this second approach. ■

rules that korbanos could, theoretically, could be brought even without a Beis HaMikdash. Therefore, when the young man declared that the lamb would be his Korban Pesach the declaration should sanctify the lamb. Accordingly, Chasam Sofer ruled that the young man must request that his vow be annulled. ■

1. שו"ת חת"ס או"ח סי' קל"ט.

2. חק יעקב סי' תסי"ט סק"א. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Daily Bread

"זה הסומך על הפלטר..."

Rav Yisrael Salanter, zt"l, provides an incisive explanation of a statement on today's daf. "On Menachos 103 we find that the curse in the verse (Devarim 28:66) 'ואל' — תאמין בחייך — And you will not believe in your life'—refers to one who must purchase bread daily from a baker.

"On the surface this seems very difficult to understand. Surely during our sojourn in the desert when the manna came down each day we were not in this category.

Yet wouldn't a person who had children wonder about his livelihood for the next day, since he was relying on another miracle for his family's food? How can we understand this? Is it plausible to say that God told us about a punishment which will happen in terrible times if it was a curse we suffered daily for forty years?

"The answer is that it all depends on one's attitude. As our sages say, one who has sustenance for today yet worries about tomorrow is a person of little faith. For such a person, lacking food for the future is surely a terrible curse since he spends his time worrying. But for one who has faith, this is not a curse at all. Since he trusts in God he does not worry. Instead of being a

curse, this situation will be a blessing since it forces him to turn his heart to God.

"This is the meaning of this curse. The curses will only come upon us if we do not obey God. For such people, even being required to rely on the baker for food is a terrible curse since they worry each day whether there will be food for the next. But for the generation of the desert this was no curse. They were on a high spiritual level and rose to the challenge, honing their bitachon through this difficulty and until they had no worry at all. Instead they continued to live the verse, 'ויאמינו בה' — And they believed in God and in Moshe His servant."¹ ■

1. אור ישראל, מאמר י"א. ■

