

19 Nissan 5774
April 19, 2014



Beitzah Daf 20

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

1. Using designated funds for an obligation

Rabbi Shimon said in the braisa that with a *todah* – *thanks offering* brought during a yom tov, one can fulfill his obligation for *simchah* – *happiness*, but not his obligation for *chagigah* – *celebration [offering]*.

The Gemora says that this seems obvious, as any obligation, like the *chagigah*, may only be fulfilled with something unconsecrated.

The Gemora explains that he is teaching that this is true even if his pledge of the *todah* was with the stipulation that he could use it to fulfill his *chagigah* obligation, as Rabbi Yochanan answered Raish Lakish.

Raish Lakish asked him about the status of one who pledged a *todah*, with the stipulation that he may use it to fulfill his *chagigah* obligation, or one who pledged to become a *nazir*, on condition that he can bring his required sacrifices from *ma'aser shaini* funds. He answered that the pledge takes effect, but his stipulation does not.

The Gemora relates a story of one who told people to give 400 zuz to a certain person, who

should marry his daughter, and Rav Pappa ruled that he gets the 400 zuz, whether or not he decides to marry the person's daughter.

The Gemora explains that if he had said that he will marry his daughter and get 400 zuz, he only gets the money if he marries the daughter. Meraimar was sitting and stated the rules of one who pledged the *todah* or *nezirus* with stipulations on his own. Ravina said to him that he learned these as Raish Lakish's question and Rabbi Yochanan's answer, as cited earlier.

2. Leaning on obligatory shelamim

A Tanna taught in front of Rabbi Yitzchak bar Abba that the verse which says that Aharon offered the olah (on the 8th day of milu'im), and performed its service *kamisphat* – *like the rule* teaches that he followed the rules of a voluntary olah. This teaches that one must lean on obligatory olah just as on a voluntary one.

Rabbi Yitzchak bar Abba told him that this braisa follows Bais Shamai, who do not learn the requirement of leaning for an obligatory *shelamim* from a voluntary one, as Bais Hillel,

who do learn it, would also learn leaning for an obligatory olah from a voluntary one.

The Gemora challenges this, as perhaps Bais Hillel only know that leaning is required on an obligatory shelamim from an obligatory olah, but not from a voluntary one, and therefore they also agree to this explanation of the verse cited by the Tanna.

The Gemora asks how Bais Hillel could learn this. Just as they can't learn from a voluntary shelamim, since it is not as common, they also should not learn from an obligatory olah, since it is not fully burned.

The Gemora answers that they can learn from the common denominator of the two. Although a voluntary shelamim is more common, that cannot be the reason for leaning, since an obligatory olah is also not common, and still needs leaning. Similarly, although an obligatory olah is fully burned, that cannot be the reason for leaning, since a voluntary shelamim, which is not fully burned, also needs leaning.

The Gemora challenges Rabbi Yitzcha bar Abba's assumption that Bais Shamai do not require leaning on obligatory shelamim from a braisa in which Rabbi Yossi says that the dispute of Bais Shamai and Bais Hillel about obligatory shelamim is not the requirement for leaning, but when the leaning must be done. Bais Shamai says it need

not be done immediately prior to the sacrifice, and therefore must be done before Yom Tov, while Bais Hillel says it must be immediately prior, and therefore must be done on Yom Tov.

The Gemora answers that Rabbi Yitzchak bar Abba follows Rabbi Yossi beRabbi Yehuda, who says in another braisa that they agree that leaning must be done immediately prior to the sacrifice, and their dispute is whether one needs to lean on obligatory shelamim at all.

3. *Bais Shamai and Bais Hillel*

The Gemora cites a braisa which relates a story about Hillel, who brought a Yom Tov olah to the Bais Hamikdash on Yom Tov to lean on and offer. The students of Shamai gathered around him, and asked him what type of sacrifice he was offering. To avoid strife, he told them that it was a female to be brought as a shelamim, and waved its tail in front of them as if to prove its gender. On that day, Bais Shamai had the upper hand over Bais Hillel, and they tried to establish the ruling like them. One elder of Bais Shamai knew that the true ruling was like Bais Hillel, and he therefore send messengers to bring all the good sheep in Yerushalayim to the Bais Hamikdash. He stood them up, and announced that whoever wants to come and lean on them may do so. On that day, Bais Hillel had the upper hand, and they established the ruling like them, with no one protesting.

The Gemora cites another story about a student of Bais Hillel who brought an olah to the Bais Hamikdash to lean on. A student of Bais Shamai encountered him and asked *ma zu smicha – what's this leaning?!*, to which the student responded, *ma zu shtika – what's this [? Better is] silence!*, silencing him with his rebuke.

Abaye says that we learn from here that when a young Torah scholar is told something to which he must reply, he should answer in the same measure as what he was told, as the student of Bais Hillel responded in the same fashion as the student of Bais Shamai spoke to him.

The Gemora cites braisos detailing the debate between Bais Shamai and Bais Hillel. Bais Hillel argued that if on Shabbos, when one may not do work for his own needs, he may offer sacrifices to Hashem, on Yom Tov, when one may do work for his own needs (i.e., food preparation), he should certainly be allowed to offer sacrifices. Bais Shamai countered that we see from voluntary sacrifices, which are not offered on Yom Tov, that this logical argument is incorrect. Bais Hillel countered that voluntary sacrifices are different, since they have no set time in which they must be brought, as opposed to the obligatory sacrifices of Yom Tov, which may not be brought afterwards. Bais Shamai responded that the Yom Tov sacrifices are also not limited to Yom Tov, since they may be brought throughout the holiday, but Bais Hillel consider them to be

limited in time, since one may not bring them once the holiday is over. Bais Shamai responded that the verse says that one may do work *lachem – for you*, which excludes doing work for Hashem (i.e., sacrifices), but Bais Hillel replied that the other verse says that we must celebrate a holiday *Lashem – for Hashem*, which includes any work done for Hashem.

The Gemora explains that Bais Hillel say that the phrase “for you” excludes work done for a non-Jew or an animal.

Abba Shaul's version of Bais Hillel's argument was that if in a situation where your oven is closed (i.e., Shabbos), your Master's oven is open (i.e., sacrifices can be brought), then certainly in a situation where your oven is open (i.e., Yom Tov), your Master's should be open.

The Gemora explains that the difference between these versions is whether Bais Hillel say that one may bring voluntary sacrifices on Yom Tov, as Abba Shaul does not include that section of debate in his version.

Rav Huna says that one should not think that the opinion that prohibits offering voluntary sacrifices on Yom Tov says so only Rabbinically, lest one push them off to the holiday. Rather, this opinion says that the Torah prohibits their offering on Yom Tov. We see from the two loaves offered on Shavuos, which cannot be brought



earlier, and yet must be baked before Yom Tov and Shabbos, indicating that anything which need not be done on Yom Tov may not be done.

4. *Sprinkling the blood of a voluntary sacrifice*

The Gemora asks what would be the rule if one slaughtered a voluntary offering on Yom Tov (according to the opinion that prohibits it).

Rava says that he may sprinkle the blood to permit the meat to be eaten, while Rabba bar Rav Huna that he may do so to enable the fats to be sacrificed after Yom Tov.

The Gemora explains that the difference between these is a case when the meat became impure or was lost, since Rava only allows the sprinkling if the meat can be eaten.

The Gemora cites a braisa which says that if one slaughtered the sheep sacrifices brought with the two loaves incorrectly (not for their sake, or at the wrong time), the blood should be sprinkled and the meat may be eaten. If it was Shabbos, he may not sprinkle, but if he did, it allows him to offer the fats at night.

The braisa's statement that sprinkling only for the fats is only valid after the fact supports Rava, who only allows it if one can eat the meat today.

The Gemora either leaves it as a question on Rabbah bar Rav Huna, or deflects it by saying that the prohibition of sprinkling on Shabbos is more severe than the prohibition of doing so on Yom Tov.

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Chulin in the Courtyard of the Beis HaMikdash

The Gemara states that there was an incident where Hillel brought his olahs reiyah to the Courtyard of the Beis HaMikdash to perform semichah on Yom Tov. The students of Beis Shammai questioned Hillel regarding the animal, and Hillel responded that it was a female animal that he was bringing as a shelamim. Hillel shook the tail of the animal as if to show them that it was a female and they left. Beis Shammai was hoping to have the upper hand over Beis Hillel, when Bava Ben Buta, an elderly student of Shammai, who knew that the halacha followed Beis Hillel, sent messengers to bring the best sheep from Jerusalem. He placed the sheep in the Courtyard of the Beis HaMikdash and he declared that whoever wanted to lean on an animal and offer the animal as a sacrifice could do so. On that day Beis Hillel had the upper hand over Beis Shammai and the halacha was established in accordance with Beis Hillel and no one objected.

Tosfos wonders how Bava ben Buta brought sheep into the Courtyard of the Beis HaMikdash,



as there is a rule that one cannot bring Chullin into the Courtyard of the Bais HaMikdash. Tosfos answers that Bava Ben Buta did not necessarily bring the animals into the courtyard of the Bais HaMikdash. Rather, he brought them onto the Temple Mount.

this opportunity by making trivial requests. Rather, when one prays to HaShem, he should pray that the great desecration of HaShem's Name in the world be removed and that we merit the arrival of Moshiach speedily in our days.

DAILY MASHAL

Do not Leave the Master's Table Empty

The Gemara states that Bais Hillel used the following kal vachomer to prove that one can offer an olah reiyah on Yom Tov. If on Shabbos, when cooking is prohibited, one can offer sacrifices to HaShem, then certainly on Yom Tov, when cooking is permitted, one should be allowed to offer sacrifices. It is only just that your table should not be full while your Master's table is empty. It is worth noting that this expression, "your table should not be full while your Master's table is empty," is applicable to all situations in life. One manifestation of this idea is regarding prayer. One normally assumes that prayer is for ones own self, where he has the opportunity to request that HaShem provide him with his needs. Rav Shimshon Pinkus zt"l and yibadel maichayim lechayim, Rav Yitzchak Zilberstein, Shlita, in Aleinu Leshabeiach, write that if one has the opportunity to be granted an audience with the King of Kings, it would seem foolish to squander