

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Offspring of a tereifah

The Gemara presents two ways to understand the debate as to whether the offspring of a tereifah may be offered as a korban.

R' Huna offers an explanation of the point of dispute between Chachamim and R' Eliezer.

Rava cites a Baraisa that supports R' Huna's understanding of the dispute.

Abaye rejects this proof and cites another Baraisa as support for his understanding which Rava accepts.

### 2) A baby animal that nursed from a tereifah

The reason a baby animal that nursed from a tereifah is unfit for a korban is explained.

### 3) Redemption to feed to the dogs

The source that we do not redeem a consecrated item to feed to the dogs is identified.

A different interpretation of that pasuk is presented.

### הדרן עלך כל האסורין

**4) MISHNAH:** The Mishnah contrasts items sanctified for the altar and items sanctified for Beis HaMikdash upkeep.

### 5) Temurah

The Gemara unsuccessfully challenges the Mishnah's assertion that any animal that is consecrated for a korban can affect temurah.

### 6) Paying craftsmen

The source that consecrated items may be used to pay craftsmen is cited.

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the status of a chick hatched from an egg of a tereifah bird?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. Can a sacred item be redeemed if it will not be fit for human consumption?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Is it possible to make a temurah from the offspring of a korban?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. What is the point of dispute between R' Eliezer and R' Ada bar Ahava?  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Consecrating objects for the general upkeep of the Mikdash*  
הקדש בדק הבית חל על הכל

The Mishnah teaches that a statement of consecration in dedicating something to the general upkeep of the Mikdash (בדק הבית) can apply to any item. Rashi explains that this refers to the validity of such a statement even when made in reference to wood or stone. In his Commentary to the Mishnah, Rambam says that the novelty of the Mishnah's statement is to include animals that are blemished and those that are non-kosher. These types of animals obviously may not be consecrated for the Altar, but they may be dedicated for their value to the general fund of the Mikdash. R' Ovadiah of Bertinoro combines these commentaries and he writes that the ruling of the Mishnah teaches that consecration for the general upkeep of the Mikdash may even apply to wood and non-kosher animals. Tosafos Yom Tov notes that it is unusual to have a grouping as arranged by the Bertinoro. Usually we find wood and stone listed together, or blemished and non-kosher animals as a group. However, the listing of wood and non-kosher animals is an uncommon grouping.

Tosafos Yom Tov and Sefer Bnei Shmuel also point out that Rashi's comment that wood is only available to be donated to the general fund of the Mikdash is noteworthy, because wood can actually be donated for the Altar itself to be used as firewood for the flame. Bnei Shmuel answers that there are times during the year when wood is not accepted for the stockpile of wood for the Altar, for example after the fifteenth of Av (see Ta'anis 26a) when the wood might have too high of a moisture level, or it may be rotten. Others explain that our Mishnah is speaking about donating grape-vine or olive wood, which are not used on the Altar.

Shiurei R' Meshulam Dovid HaLevi poses additional insights into Rashi's commentary. In Menachos 106b we find that according to Rebbe, a person may donate wood for the Mikdash for a "wood offering" for the Altar. Why, then, does Rashi use wood as an example of something that would typically be used only for the general fund of the Mikdash as opposed to being used for the Altar itself? He leaves this question unresolved.

Furthermore, it would seem obvious that stone and wood would be allowed to be given for בדק הבית, because these are materials which can be used for construction and repairs of the structure of the Mikdash itself. In this regard, Rambam's explanation that the Mishnah is referring to a blemished or non-kosher animal is a more plausible rendering of the Mishnah's intent. Yet Rambam himself (Hilchos Me'ilah 5:1) says that one may consecrate items such as stones or beams for the general fund of the Mikdash. What is the novelty of this emphasis? It seems that Rashi and Rambam are including even objects which cannot be used for the Altar, but they may be consecrated generally. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Distribution of tzedaka funds

*One who sanctifies his possessions etc.*

There was a person who passed away and he left behind 2000 rubles. His instructions were that the profits that would be earned from that money would be distributed to the local gemach, bikkur cholim, Talmud Torah and the R' Meir Baal HaNes fund. In his town there was an Ashkenazi kehilla and a Sephardi kehilla. The gemach and bikkur cholim fund was shared by both kehillos but each kehilla had a separate Talmud Torah and R' Meir Baal HaNes fund. Since the donor was a member of the Ashkenazi kehilla it is clear that the money would be distributed to the Ashkenazi Talmud Torah and R' Meir Baal HaNes fund together with the communal bikkur cholim and gemach. Some time later the Sephardi community decided to make their own bikkur cholim fund and requested that the percentage of the money that would be given for bikkur cholim should be divided into two parts. The gabbaim of the original fund, however, did not want to give up half of those funds.

Teshuvah Even Shesiyah<sup>1</sup> cited a Tosefta that teaches that if a person pledges money to a Beis HaKnesses the money should be given to the Beis HaKnesses where he used to daven. Accordingly, since the donor was a member of the Ashkenazi kehilla it is logical that the bikkur cholim money should be given to the Ashkenazi bikkur cholim. However, the matter remains in doubt since at the time of the donor's death there was only one fund which was shared by both kehillos. Perhaps both

המקדיש נכסיו וכו'

### 7) Unspecified consecrated items

It is noted that the Mishnah's ruling that unspecified consecrated items are assumed to be for Beis HaMikdash upkeep is inconsistent with R' Yehoshua.

This understanding of the dispute is at odds with R' Ada bar Ahava's understanding of the dispute in the Baraisa.

A second version of R' Ada bar Ahava's explanation of the dispute is recorded.

The first version of R' Ada bar Ahava's explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

### 8) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara identifies what two phrases in the Mishnah intend to include. ■

kehillos have an equal claim to this money and it should be shared. He then cited our Gemara that discusses what is done with animals that were sanctified together with the rest of one's property. Do we assume that the property that could be used for a korban is used for a korban and the rest of the property is for Beis HaMikdash upkeep or perhaps a person intends for all his property to go to the same place? Rambam<sup>2</sup> rules that all the property goes to the same place since we assume a person does not wish to divide his pledge. Seemingly the same principle applies for tzedaka and we would assume that he wants all of his money to go to the same place. Therefore, whenever there are two funds, one Ashkenazi and one Sephardi the money will go to the Ashkenazi fund in the case of an Ashkenazi donor. ■

1. שו"ת אבן שתיה סי' ע"ח.

2. רמב"ם פ"ה מהל' ערכין וחרמין ה"ז. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The Destruction before the Renewal

אימת גדלה לכי מסרחא וכי אסרחא עפרא בעלמא הוא

Our sages tell us that one who mourns the destruction of the Beis HaMikdash will see its comfort. The Maharal, zt"l, was asked why this should be so. "What difference does it make if one mourns the destruction or not? If one is present in the ultimate future isn't it obvious that he will experience the nechamah?"

The Maharal explained the need to mourn to attain the nechamah. "Before something comes to a new level, it first

must decompose. In the creation of the world, God first made tohu va'vohu; only then could the world come into being. When a seed is planted in the ground, it decomposes. Only then can a tree sprout. The same is true with the gestation of a man or an animal. The seed must decompose before the embryo begins to grow. The same is true regarding an egg, as we find in Temurah 31. First the egg must decompose; then it can become a chick. The reason for this phenomenon is that there must be a lack for more perfection to fill. If there is nothing missing, it is impossible to come to a new level. Similarly, one who does not mourn the destruction of the Beis HaMikdash feels complete. He has no space for the nechamah, since he never

experienced the lack in the first place!"<sup>1</sup>

The Shem MiShmuel, zt"l, learns a practical lesson from this same statement. "One who wishes to start again and that his earlier sins should not be considered should make himself like dirt. He must completely nullify all of his senses and desires to God. In this way, he will become a completely new creation. The proof to this is from the case of a ger. Although a ger comes from a distant spiritual place, he is like a newborn baby by making just such a new start. He immerses in a mikveh to symbolize this, and if he is male he does a bris. Why should a Jew who makes a new start be any less?"<sup>2</sup> ■

1. נצח ישראל

2. שם משמואל, פרשת וארא ופרשת נצבים ■