

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

Abaye concludes his successful challenge to Rabbah's qualification of the early part of R' Akiva's statement.

### 2) An unusable Korban Pesach

According to Shmuel, whenever in the case of a Korban Chattas the animal would be left to die a Korban Pesach is brought as a Korban Shelamim. Similarly, any case where a Korban Chattas would be left to graze a Korban Pesach would also be left to graze. R' Yochanan disagreed in the first case where the animal is found before the slaughter of the replacement.

The Gemara successfully challenges Shmuel's ruling and concludes that Shmuel made only the first ruling and not the second, and his intent was to disagree with R' Yochanan.

A second version of the Gemara's analysis of Shmuel's statement is presented.

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents instances when an animal designated as a Korban Pesach is offered as a Korban Shelamim. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What are the five cases where a korban chattas is left to die?
2. What is the dispute between Rabbi and Chachamim regarding a lost chattas?
3. How is R' Shimon's position regarding the five chatta'os different than the position held by others?
4. What is done with the proceeds of the sale of a female animal designated as a Korban Pesach?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
By the Merzel Family  
In loving memory of their father  
ר' אליהו בן ר' ישעי' ע"ה

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Designating two animals for one Chattas

הפריש שתי חטאות לאחריות

Tosafos analyzes the case which the Gemara discusses where a person sets aside two animals for his Chattas requirement. If the person designated one animal to be his Chattas, and he then declared that a second animal, as well, should be for his Chattas obligation, there is no legal significance to his second statement. Once the first animal was set aside and was sanctified as a Chattas, there is no meaning to declaring sanctity upon any other animals for that same obligation, and the person would have no right to bring the second animal to discharge his legal responsibility to bring a Chattas.

If the person declared upon both animals together that one should be his Chattas, neither animal has kedushah. Here again, the statement does not result in the person's having the option to bring either one that he chooses, as R' Oshia states. The legal failure is based upon the statement of Rabba (Eiruvin 50a): "Any situation where the owner cannot bring one after the other, he cannot bring either one by itself."

Tosafos answers that we could be dealing with a case where the person clearly indicated that only one of the animals is sanctified as his Chattas, with the second animal being designated as אחריות—a legal back-up in case anything happens to the first animal. In this case, the person may then choose any one of the animals for his offering, being that they each were selected to serve in this role.

Tosafos (Menachos 80a, ד"ה הפריש) writes that the case of R' Oshia where two animals were designated for Chattas where the owner can choose either animal to bring as his offering could be a case where the person declared, "Let one of these two animals become sanctified." This declaration uses the concept of ברירה, so that when the person later chooses one of the animals, we consider that animal to be the one he had in mind from the beginning. This is similar to where a person has eighty loaves in front of him for a Todah, but he only has to sanctify forty of them for to accompany the offering. If he declares that "forty out of the eighty loaves shall be sanctified," this statement is binding, and he may then select any forty that he wishes to be for his Todah. Tosafos there notes that this functions based upon the concept of ברירה, but Tosafos also tries to resolve how it may work otherwise, as well. ■

## HALACHAH Highlight

### Forbidden fats of the animal

אם עז הפסיק הענין לימד על העז שאין טעון אליה, [כלומר שאין מקריבין אלא האליה (הזנב) של כבש, ולא של עז.]

When it says, "if a goat," it divides up the subject. This teaches that in regards to the goat, it does not require its fat tail to be burned. (Meaning, there is only an obligation to burn the tail of a lamb and not a goat.)

Based on the citation above, the Gemara in Kreisos<sup>1</sup> determines that it is permitted to eat the fat tail of a non-sanctified animal. For when the Torah forbade the eating of the חלב of non-sanctified animals it said, "All the חלב of the ox, lamb, and goat may not be eaten," implying that the Torah only forbade something which is forbidden in all three of them. Only the fat tail of the lamb is offered and not of the ox or goat, and therefore, it is permitted if it is unsanctified. The Rishonim explain<sup>2</sup> that the above applies to the outer part of the fat tail on the lamb. However, the inner part of the tail is חלב and is forbidden in all of the 3 animals (lamb, ox, and goat) listed above. This is the ruling of the Shulchan Aruch<sup>3</sup>.

The Rema<sup>4</sup> writes that one must remove the strands of the fat tail for they draw taste from the חלב of the kidneys. See below how they precisely remove these strands. ■

1. כריתות דף ד' ע"א, וכן עי' בחולין קי"ז א'
2. כ"כ הב"י ביור"ד סימן ס"ד סעיף ה' בשם מהר"י ו' חניב, ושכן מבואר ברי"ף ורמב"ם ועע"ש בשם המרדכי בשם הרא"ם והרוקח. [אמנם בספר המצות שהובא בהגהות מיימוניות במאכ"א פ"ז סוף ס"ק א', משמע שהחלב גמור שהוא תותב קרום וניקלף, (שהוא החלב הנ"ל שבצ"ד פנים של העליה) הוא זה שהתורה התירתו באליה. וצ"ע. ועע"ש בדרכי תשובה ס"ק ל"א שהביא בזה מחלוקת ותמה על המקילין. ולהנ"ל ה"ז מחלוקת ראשונים. וע"ע בביאור המלבי"ם לספרא, בויקרא פ"ג אות קפ"ב]
3. ביור"ד סימן ס"ד סעיף ה', וז"ל האליה מותרת ובלבד שינקר ממנה מה שלצד פנים, עכ"ל, ועע"ש בט"ז סק"ו
4. הרמ"א שם. וכבת הטור בסימן ס"ה וז"ל ונוטל הסכין וחותר באליה ומוציא ממנה חוט שמתחלק לשניים וממשיך החוט מעיקר האליה עד קצותה מאותן פנים המקישים על ירכי הבהמי, וכא"כ נוטל הסכין וגורר מאותן הפנים גופן וכו' מן העצמות, וגורר יפה עד שישתנה מקום גבהות החומרים עם השפלות שביניהן ולא ישתיר לכל פני האליה לא בשר ולא שמנונית אלא גוררין יפה. עכ"ל. והעתיקו העה"ש סימן ס"ג. ועע"ש בדרכי תשובה בהרחבה. וע"ע בכה"ח שם ס"ק ט"ו. וכמובן שבכ"ז צריך שהבקי יראה לו למעשה, מה ואיך יעשה ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

### Complete faith

כשב לרבות את הפסח לאליה... לימד על העז שאין טעון אליה.

Sheep embody the trusting relationship we enjoy with our Shepherd. The Pesach can also be brought from goats—but the עז does have more of an independent character. Although the goat is as obedient to his shepherd as the sheep, its nature is to offer opposition to strangers. The tail of the goat must therefore be withheld, for boldness must be used with care. But even the extreme end-piece of the sheep is part of the offering—because its qualities of faith and trust should be employed to the utmost.

A soldier entered an inn in the middle of the night, knocked three times on the table with his staff, and left. Completely at a loss, the Ba'al Shem Tov looked to his host, but the old innkeeper seemed joyous and unconcerned. Half an hour later, it happened again.

"What does this mean?"

"This is a warning from the landlord. After another knock, I will have three hours to pay the rent. If I don't, my entire family will be thrown into prison." Again, he seemed happily unconcerned.

"You must have the money, then," assumed the Ba'al Shem Tov.

"Oh no, not a penny! But I still have plenty of time, and God will provide." Soon the soldier came again, and the innkeeper prepared to

go for a walk.

"Do you have the money?"

"No, but God will provide!"

From a distance, the Ba'al Shem Tov could see the innkeeper on the road. Just then, a carriage pulled up next to the old man, there was an exchange, a sack changed hands, and the innkeeper went on his way.

The Ba'al Shem Tov flagged down the carriage. "What happened?" "I offered the innkeeper a sum for the coming year's wine yield. We haggled over the price, but I gave in because I know he is honest. I gave him the money, and he said he was going to pay the rent."

The Ba'al Shem Tov exclaimed: "See how great is the power of faith!" ■