

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Offering an offering for the sake of a different type of offering (cont.)

The Gemara concludes its discussion of whether heirs inherit an animal set aside to be an offering.

R' Assi and R' Ashi discuss whether an heir can effect temurah with an inherited offering.

### 2) Atonement

The Gemara inquires whether an animal offered שלא לשמה effects atonement for the sin for which the offering was supposed to be brought.

R' Shisha the son of R' Idi answers that it is logical that it does not effect atonement.

This response is unsuccessfully challenged.

### 3) Atonement of a Olah offering

The Gemara inquires whether an Olah offering will atone for violations of positive commands committed after the animal was designated as an offering.

A Baraisa is cited to resolve this inquiry.

Rava rejects this proof.

R' Huna the son of Yehudah rejects Rava's interpretation of the Baraisa.

Another attempt is made to resolve the Gemara's inquiry about an Olah offering atoning for violations of positive commands that happened after the animal was designated as an offering.

The proof from the Baraisa is rejected.

This alternative explanation is challenged but defended by R' Pappa.

R' Yosef the son of R' Shmuel challenged R' Pappa's explanation. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Explain the Gemara's question: כיפרו על מה שבאו או לא כיפרו.
2. What is derived from the progression of words וסמך...ונרצה...לכפר?
3. What are שירי מצוה?
4. When do communal offerings become designated as a particular type of offering?

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Designation of the slaughtering knife for communal offerings

קרבתות צבור סכין מושכתן למה שהן

An olah offering atones for a positive commandment which was neglectfully not fulfilled. The Gemara asked whether an olah may atone for additional positive commandments which were not fulfilled after the animal was designated as an olah, but before the offering was actually brought. The question is whether we compare the function of an olah with that of a chattas. A chattas can only atone for a sin which was committed before the animal was designated for an offering, as the verse states (Vayikra 4:23), "When he becomes aware of his sin, he shall then bring his offering." If we use the same rule here, an olah would only atone for positive commandments which were already neglected before the animal was designated as an offering. On the other hand, an olah might be different, as one olah offering may be brought for numerous positive commandments which were neglected, so we could understand why this olah may atone for oversights which occurred even after the animal was selected to be an offering.

The Gemara brought the case of the two goats offered on Shevuos, and the Gemara determined that one is brought for violations of impurity of the Mikdash, and the other is brought just after the first one, and it atones for further violations of tum'ah which might have occurred subsequent to the first goat's being brought. This indicates that the offering may atone for a situation which developed even after the goat was selected as an offering. Rav Pappa responds that the goats of Shevuos are communal offerings, and the rule is that beis din manipulates the arrangements to accommodate its needs. Here, the second animal is not considered holy until it is about to be offered, which is after the commission of any violation of tum'ah for which it is to atone. The basis for this power of beis din is that "the knife used for slaughter draws the animal to fulfill its purpose."

Rashi here explains that this rule teaches that we may

(Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 Mr. and Mrs. Paul Pinkus  
 In loving memory of their mother  
 מרת טויבע שרה בת הרב טובי' גוטמאן, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 In loving memory of their mother  
 מרת רות בת ר' מרדכי סטפנסקי ע"ה

## HALACHAH Highlight

### Reciting a beracha when doing a mitzvah on another's behalf

התורם משלו על של חברו

One who separates terumah from his own produce on behalf of his friend's produce

The Gemara teaches that if Reuven separates produce to be terumah for Shimon's produce, Reuven has the right to distribute it to the person of his choice (טובת הנאה). Rashi<sup>1</sup> explains that if a non-kohen offers money to Reuven to give the terumah to his grandchildren who are kohanim, Reuven has the right to keep that money even though the terumah was separated on behalf of Shimon.

Teshuvos Divrei Yatziv<sup>2</sup> ruled that when one person performs a mitzvah on behalf of another without his knowledge he does not make the beracha on that mitzvah. It is only when one performs a mitzvah for another with his knowledge that the agent may recite the beracha on that mitzvah. He then mentions Rambam's ruling that is based on the statement in our Gemara that Reuven can separate produce on behalf of Shimon and comments that this separation is effective only בדיעבד. Maharit Algazi also writes that this separation is effective only if Shimon gives his approval to Reuven's action once he is informed that Reuven separated terumah on his behalf. Accordingly, since the separation is effective only בדיעבד, Reuven may not make the beracha when he separates the produce as terumah for Shimon's produce since Shimon may not give his approval and then it would emerge that the mitzvah was never performed.

Another reason why Reuven does not make the beracha when he separates terumah on behalf of Shimon is that

(Insight...continued from page 1)

reassign any sheep which was designated for the daily tamid offerings for the previous year's supply, and now slaughter it for an olah for kayitz hamizbeach this year. Therefore, we use the power of beis din, and declare that the original intent of procuring this animal will be as we see fit as time tells. Tosafos questions Rashi's approach, because the concept of "the power of beis din" can actually allow us to redeem the consecration of these animals even though they have no blemish, and the animal can revert to not being consecrated at all. These same animals may then be repurchased with the new funds from the current year and be used for the tamid offering. Tosafos HaRosh explains that Rashi holds according to R' Shimon, "the power of beis din" can only help to change a communal offering from one form to another (tamid to kayitz hamizbeach), whereas Chachamim hold it can even function to redeem the animal to be chullin. ■

Shimon does not fulfill the mitzvah when Reuven separates terumah for him. In order to be credited with a mitzvah one must either perform the action of the mitzvah or have intent for the mitzvah to be performed on his behalf. Since in this case neither criterion is present Shimon cannot be credited with a mitzvah. How then would it be possible for Reuven to make the beracha on the mitzvah of separating terumah if the one for whom it is separated is not credited with the mitzvah? Teshuvos Tiferes Yosef<sup>3</sup> also writes that when Reuven separates terumah on behalf of Shimon it is only effective as far as the produce is concerned but Shimon is not credited with the mitzvah. ■

1. רש"י ד"ה והתורם.

2. שו"ת דברי יציב יו"ד סי' ק"צ.

3. שו"ת תפארת יוסף יו"ד סי' ל"א. ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

### A Constant Offering

ראוין היו ישראל להקריב קרבנות בכל עת

The Satmar Rav, zt"l, once explained the importance of learning kodoshim whenever possible from a statement on today's daf. "The verse states, 'צו את אהרן ואת בניו לאמר' — Command Aharon and his sons, to say...' The Midrash explains that the word 'לאמר' teaches that Moshe should tell the Jewish people to recite the parshah of the olah offering even though they also bring

the offering so as to merit both.

"This seems somewhat difficult. Although it is obvious that during the exile we must be vigilant to read the parshah of olah since this is considered as if we brought an olah, why do we need this when there is a beis hamikdash and sacrifices abound?

"The answer can be understood from the Gemara in Zevachim 6. There we find that it would have been fitting for us to continually bring sacrifices. The reason Hashem does not require this is that He has mercy on us and does not require such a huge outlay of money. Clearly this reasoning is only applicable

to actually offering up a live animal for a korban. But regarding learning, we must certainly learn the parshah and halachos of korbanos as often as we can so that we in some way discharge our obligation.

"We can also understand this from Rashi there. He says that the verse uses the language of 'צו — command' — since the Torah tells us to act with alacrity when there is חסרון כס, a monetary loss. Due to our obligation to offer sacrifices all day if not for חסרון כס, the verse must warn us to act with alacrity to learn these halachos as often as possible." ■

1. דברי יואל, צו. ■