



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Atonement of an Olah offering (cont.)

R' Yosef the son of R' Shmuel concludes his challenge against R' Pappa's interpretation and proceeds to challenge the Gemara's initial understanding of the Baraisa.

The Gemara answers the second challenge.

### 2) Slaughtering a Todah for the sake of a Todah of one's friend

Rabbah and R' Yosef disagree about the validity of a Todah that was slaughtered for the sake of one's friend.

Each Amora explains the rationale behind his position.

Rabbah suggests a support for his position but it is rejected.

### 3) Rava's rulings

Rava rules that a Chatas slaughtered for another type of Chatas is valid but for an Olah it is invalid.

The source for these halachos is cited.

Rava rules that if a Chatas was slaughtered for someone else obligated to bring a Chatas the offering is invalid but if it was slaughtered for someone who was obligated to bring an Olah the offering is valid.

The source for these halachos is cited.

Rava rules that a Chatas slaughtered for one who was not obligated to bring a Chatas is invalid.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

Rava rules that it is prohibited to throw the blood of an Olah slaughtered not for its own sake.

The source for this ruling is presented.

Rava provides parameters for determining the status of an Olah brought after the owner died.

R' Pinchas the son of R' Ami offers a related statement and the Gemara discusses whether his intent is to disagree with Rava's ruling.

Rava states that an Olah is considered a gift to Hashem to

*(Continued on page 2)*

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *An olah is a tribute to the King*

ואמר רבא עולה דורון היא

The Gemara cites several halachos of Rava regarding changes in the intention of the offering being brought, and in regard to ownership of the offering. Rava then makes a general statement regarding an olah offering. "An olah is a gift," he says. It is not brought for atonement for neglect to perform a positive commandment, because atonement is achieved when the person does teshuva. Rashi explains that the olah offering brought subsequent to the teshuva is considered like a gift one would send to a king against whom one has sinned. Even after the king has forgiven his subject, the repentant servant of the king will later send a gift as a tribute to the king before he will be accepted to greet the king.

Rava proves his point with a simple analysis. If the person who brings an olah offering for having neglected to perform a positive commandment has not yet done teshuva, we know that such an offering alone cannot serve as atonement. The verse in Mishlei (21:27) states, "An offering of the evil is despicable." On the other hand, if the person has done teshuva, we learned (Yoma 86a) that if a person has not fulfilled a positive commandment and he does teshuva, he is immediately forgiven. Therefore, the circumstances of this olah must be that the person did teshuva, and he has been forgiven, but the olah is simply a tribute to the King in order to attain acceptance in His eyes.

It seems from Rava's words that an olah offering does not serve for atonement at all, as it is brought only after teshuva has already achieved this purpose. This has to be understood, because the Gemara seems to say that an olah atones for failure to fulfill a positive mitzvah, just as a chattas atones for a violation which, if done on purpose, deserves kareis. Furthermore, Rambam (Hilchos Ma'asei HaKorbanos 3:14) writes that when an olah is brought, the owner should confess regarding the positive commandments he did not fulfill and for negative commandments which are associated with positive commandments (לאו הניתק לעשה). If the olah is just a tribute, what is the significance of this confession?

Ritva (Makkos 17b) says that there are two components to a person's full atonement. A person who sinned needs atonement, and he also needs to appease the king against whom he sinned. The olah completes the process which was begun with teshuva. Teshuva atones, but in a peripheral sense, while the olah and its ability to appease complete the process. This is why Rambam writes that a confession is appropriate to be done at the time of the offering of the olah. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Why is the blood of the second Atzeres Goat thrown on the altar?

2. What is the status of a Chatas that was slaughtered for another person who was obligated to offer an Olah?

3. What is the significance of the statement that an Olah is a דורון?

4. What is derived from the word זבחת?

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Is a Todah offering an obligatory offering?

תודה ששחטה לשם תודת חברו

A Todah that was slaughtered for the sake of a friend's Todah

There are four circumstances that generate a need for one to offer a Todah offering. The four circumstances are: 1. Traveling by sea, 2. Travelling through the desert, 3. Recovering from illness and 4. Being released from prison. Rav Shmuel HaLevi Wosner<sup>1</sup>, author of Teshuvos Shevet HaLevi, was asked whether a person who experiences a miracle is obligated to offer a Korban Todah or perhaps it is only a voluntary korban. Rashi<sup>2</sup> in his commentary to the Torah uses language which indicates that one is obligated to bring a Korban Todah when he emerges from one of these four experiences. Pri Megadim, however, asserts that when Rashi uses the term “obligatory” he meant that it is Rabbinically mandatory. Biblically it is appropriate for one to offer a Todah offering following these four incidents but it is not mandatory. Shevet Halevi also cites Maharam Shik who also seems to maintain that one is not obligated to bring a Todah offering following one of these four experiences.

Shevet HaLevi then notes that these earlier authorities did not see the authentic commentary of Rashi to the Gemara in Menachos (79b) where he clearly spells out his perspective. In discussing an obligatory Todah offering Rashi<sup>3</sup> offers two explanations how this obligation is created. In his first explanation Rashi writes that an obligation is generated when a person makes a verbal declaration that he will bring a Todah offering. In this regard a Todah offering is no different than any other voluntary offering in that one's declaration can generate an obligation. According to Rashi's second explanation an obligation is created when a person emerges from one of the four miraculous experiences. Accordingly, when Rashi in Chumash refers

(Overview...continued from page 1)

express thank to Hashem for granting forgiveness for a transgression.

Rava proves his assertion and then a Baraisa is cited that supports Rava's statement.

### 4) Pesach offered with the wrong intent

The source that a Pesach offered with the wrong intent is invalid is presented.

It is noted that that source only addresses a change of holiness so another source is cited that addresses the issue of a change of owner.

The source that intent is essential and not just a mitzvah is presented.

R' Safra challenges this source and suggests an alternative source.

The Gemara explains that although the verse cited addresses the slaughtering of the offering, once the Torah reveals its intent in one context it is assumed to be true for the other blood services as well.

R' Ashi rejects the notion that once the Torah reveals its intent in one context it applies to other blood services as well.

The exposition that supports R' Ashi's assertion is unsuccessfully challenged.

### 5) Chatas offered with the wrong intent

The source that a Chatas offered with the wrong intent is invalid is presented.

This verse only addresses slaughtering; what is the source that the same applies to the receiving of the blood? ■

to an obligation to offer a Todah offering it should be understood as a reference to the obligation that is generated when one experiences one of the four aforementioned miracles. ■

1. שו"ת שבט הלוי ח"ג סי' קס"ג.

2. רש"י פרשת צו (ז: י"ב).

3. רש"י כ"י מנחות ע"ט: ד"ה לאחר כפרה תנינא. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## Out of the Mire

”עבר על מצות עשה ועשה תשובה...”

On today's daf we find that teshuvah atones for the neglect of a positive commandment.

Once, a certain bochur with profound yiras shamayim fell into a deep pit. At the bottom of the pit was a morass from which the boy could hardly extricate himself. As he struggled to get free he tearfully turned to Hashem and said, “Ribono Shel Olam!

I know why you have arranged for me to fall into this pit: so that I do a complete teshuvah and change my ways. Well I can guarantee that it will be impossible for me to repent until I am allowed to escape from this predicament. How can I do teshuvah when my mind is so confused and I am preoccupied with my fate? Can I then do teshuvah when I am stuck in this mud? I swear that after I escape from this difficulty I will spend time alone and make a proper cheshbon hanefesh with yishuv hada'as...”

After recounting this story, Rav Sinai of Zhamograd, זת"ל, explained, “This is

what we mean when we petition Hashem, ‘השיבנו ה' אליך ונשובה’—Restore us to You, Hashem, and we will return.’ Here we are in bitter exile. How can we do teshuvah which requires da'as, true understanding, of the folly of our ways? ‘חדש ימינו כקדם’—Renew our days as of old.’ We cannot do teshuvah when we are in such dire straights far from our land, without our holy temple desolate. First Hashem must redeem us from our exile as he took us out of Egypt. When He returns us to His land and rebuilds our holy temple, then we will do proper teshuvah!” ■

1. אריה שאג, ח"א, ע' קע"ח ■

