



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

The Gemara continues to analyze one of the expositions cited in the Baraisa that was cited to explain the rulings in the Mishnah.

R' Akiva's exposition in the Baraisa is clarified.

The exchange between the two Baraisos concerning their respective sources for the Mishnah's rulings is presented.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents different opinions regarding the status of the offspring of shelamim.

3) Offspring of Shelamim

R' Ami in the name of R' Yochanan suggests a source for R' Eliezer's position that the offspring of a shelamim may not be offered as a shelamim.

This explanation is rejected in favor of another explanation.

The Gemara presents two ways to explain R' Shimon's understanding of the dispute between R' Eliezer and Chachamim.

Rabbah adopts one way of understanding the dispute whereas R' Yehoshua ben Levi adopts the alternative understanding of the dispute.

A Baraisa is cited that supports R' Yehoshua ben Levi's understanding of the Mishnah.

Ravina explains the final section of the Baraisa.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

4) Testimony of R' Papayas

The Gemara questions how they could have waited until Sukkos to eat the offspring of the korban when they should have eaten it on Shavuot.

R' Zavid in the name of Rava offers one explanation for the testimony of R' Papayas.

R' Ashi suggests another explanation.

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

The offspring of a shelamim must be left to die

אלא אמר רב חייא בר אבא אמר ר' יוחנן היינו טעמא דר' אליעזר גזירה שמא יגדל מהם עדרים עדרים

In the Mishnah on our daf we find a disagreement among Tannaim regarding the offspring of a shelamim animal. R' Eliezer says that the offspring of a shelamim may not be brought as a shelamim. Rather, due to a rabbinic consideration which the Gemara explains, the animal must be locked in a closed cell and left to die. Chachamim hold that this offspring may be brought as a shelamim. In the Gemara, R' Chiya b. Abba concludes in the name of R' Yochanan that the reason for the opinion of R' Eliezer is that we are concerned that if it were permitted to bring this animal as an offering, its owner would delay in bringing it, allowing it to breed. Because shelamim is a relatively common offering, the owner would benefit by raising a flock of animals which are able to be brought as shelamim. A person would have an incentive to raise such a flock, but, as Rashi explains, we are afraid that in the meantime the animals might be accidentally shorn for their wool or used for work, which are prohibited uses of sanctified animals. Rabeinu Gershom says that the risk is that if a person would have a flock of these animals some confusion may result, and a person might exchange them with his regular animals, and a sanctified animal might be eaten outside of the Mikdash. Rambam, in his Commentary to the Mishnah, says that the offspring of shelamim should not be allowed to live and be collected because we are afraid that the owner might delay and end up bringing them beyond the time framework, thus being in violation of **בל תאחר**. In any case, in order to avoid these risks, the rabbis decreed that an offspring of a shelamim must be left to die.

Tosafos Yom Tov questions why Rashi did not mention Rambam's consideration, and why he instead refers to the risk that the animals might be shorn or worked. Rashash explains that we should remember that the offspring of a shelamim is actually eligible to be brought as a shelamim, but the rabbis nullified this mitzvah due to a serious concern, as mentioned by the Rishonim. Rashi holds that the rabbis would not have nullified a mitzvah of bringing a shelamim unless there was a concern that one might thereby come to violate shearing, which is an proactive act of violating a Torah precept. However, they would not have made their decree if it were only to avoid the passive violating of delay of bringing a shelamim on time. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What may be done with the offspring of a Shelamim?
.....
2. What is the point of dispute between Rabbah and R' Yehoshua ben Levi
.....
3. Is it permitted to offer as a korban an animal that is sick?
.....
4. What is the point of dispute between Rabanan and R' Elazar?
.....

HALACHAH Highlight

Fulfilling pledges to tzedaka

בל תאחר

It is prohibited to delay

Shulchan Aruch¹ writes that a pledge to give tzedaka is no different than any other vow; therefore, one who pledges to give money to tzedaka is obligated to give that money to the poor right away. In the event that the donor delays following up with his pledge he violates the prohibition of **בל תאחר** if he has the means to fulfill his pledge since the poor are readily available. In the event that poor people are not present he must set aside the money and leave it aside until poor people are found. Shach² explains that the donor is not obligated to search for poor people even if three Yomim Tovim pass; rather he is permitted to just hold on to the money and wait for poor people to come to him. Rema³ explains that Shulchan Aruch's ruling applies to tzedaka that one will distribute to the poor on his own. If one pledged to give money to a gabbai tzedaka one does not violate **בל תאחר** even if poor people are present until the gabbai asks for the money. In the event that the gabbai does not even know that he made a pledge the donor is obligated to inform the gabbai so that he should be able to ask for the money. Tur⁴ in the name of Rosh maintains that these guidelines apply when a person pledges money for tzedaka without any qualification to his pledge but it is acceptable for a person to set aside money to have available to give small amounts to poor people as he is approached.

Teshuvos B'tzeil HaChochmah⁵ elaborates on these halachos and explains that one who pledges money violates **בל תאחר** only after he is approached by a poor person with a request for money and he does not give him money that he

(Overview...continued from page 1)

The reason R' Zevid did not give R' Ashi's answer is explained.

5) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the offspring and temurah of a todah.

6) **The source for the Mishnah**
A Baraisa presents the sources for the Mishnah's ruling.

7) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the temurah and offspring of an olah. There is a dispute regarding the status of the male offspring of a female designated as an olah.

8) **Clarifying the Mishnah**
Rabbah bar bar Chanah asserts that the Mishnah's first ruling is subject to debate and follows R' Elazar's position.
Rava explains how it could even follow Rabanan.
A contradiction between two rulings of R' Elazar is noted.
R' Chisda reconciles the contradiction.
Rava offers another explanation for R' Elazar's position. ■

pledged to tzedaka. Whether he violates **בל תאחר** if the donor is approached by a second person that day and does not give him money is subject to a debate between Rishonim. According to Meiri one violates **בל תאחר** only the first time he is asked for money whereas according to Ritva he violates the prohibition each time he is asked for tzedaka, if money is available. ■

1. שו"ע יו"ד סי' רנ"ז סעי' ג'.
2. ש"ך שם סק"ה.
3. רמ"א שם.
4. טור שם.
5. שו"ת בצל החכמה ח"ד סי' ע"י. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Missing the Moment

כל יום ויום עובר עליהם

On today's daf we find that one who puts off bringing his sacrifice transgresses the prohibition of **בל תאחר** every day. We see that the moment the time has come, it is absolutely forbidden to delay.

The Alter of Kelm, ז"ל, explains this concept in depth. "The importance of alacrity cannot be stressed too strongly. When Moshe was sent to redeem the Jewish peo-

ple, he was certainly worn out from his long journey. Nevertheless, the moment he arrived at his hostel, he was immediately in danger of being killed for having delayed his son's bris. It seems clear that he would have done the milah shortly. He was taking a moment of well-deserved rest, yet all of his merits and the great merit of klal Yisrael could not save him from death. Why? Because he did not act with alacrity. For him, delaying was almost fatal. At that moment, he was distant from God because he did not do as was proper. It follows that for the time being he was not worthy of redeeming the Jewish people, and that this

merit could not help him then. The moment his son was circumcised he returned to his original level and never again acted without proper zeal.

"It seems to me that Moshe himself was not worthy of such an error. This only happened to teach us the immense importance of never delaying. But what is one to do if he has trouble internalizing this lesson? He should accustom himself to get out of bed quickly at least once a week. Like a soldier, he should not wait an instant, but rise immediately to do his duty"¹ ■

1. בית קלם, ע"י שצ"ד ■