



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov said: Also a convert is regarded as a person who still requires¹ etc. And why has the first Tanna not mentioned the convert? — He mentions only instances where the offering is to effect the permission of eating consecrated things, while in the case of the convert the offering is brought in order to qualify him to enter the congregation.²

And why has he not mentioned the nazir? The Gemara answers: After all, when the nazir brings an offering it is in order that he may be permitted to drink unconsecrated wine.

And Rabbi Eliezer, who has mentioned the nazir in reference to his qualification, why has he not stated also the instance of the tamei nazir?³— The latter offers his sacrifice only to qualify for nezirus in taharah.

Our Rabbis have taught: A convert is prevented from partaking of consecrated things before he has offered his sacrificial birds. If he has offered one single pigeon in the morning, he is permitted to partake of consecrated things in the evening.⁴ All sacrifices of birds consist of one chatas and one olah; in this case both are olah offerings. If he has offered his obligatory sacrifice⁵ from the cattle, he has done his duty; if he has offered an olah and a shelamim, he has done his duty; if a minchah — and a shelamim he has not fulfilled his duty. The prescription of birds as sacrifices is, as it were, to be regarded only as a rule towards greater leniency.⁶ Now, why doesn't a minchah and a shelamim

exempt him from his duty? Apparently because it is written: As you do, so he shall do; as you [Israelites] offer an olah and a shelamim, so shall also the convert offer an olah and a shelamim. Similarly then it should not suffice for him to offer his obligatory sacrifice from the cattle, because it is written: 'As you do, so he shall do'? — Said Rav Pappa: Argue thus: As he is included regarding the offering of a bird, should he not the more so be included regarding the olah of the cattle? If so, a minchah-offering should also exempt him! — The text has excluded it by the word 'so'. And from where do we know that he is included regarding the offering of a bird? — For our Rabbis taught: [It is written.] 'As you do, so shall he do': As you offer an olah and a shelamim, so shall also he offer an olah and a shelamim, as it is indeed confirmed in the text: As you are, so shall the stranger be. From where do we know that he is included concerning the offering of a bird? It is written: An offering made by fire, of a satisfying aroma to Hashem, which is the offering that is wholly to Hashem? You must say: This is the olah of the bird. I might then include also the minchah; therefore it reads 'so'.

Another [Baraisa] teaches: [From the text,] 'and will offer an offering made by fire, of a satisfying aroma to Hashem', I might derive everything that is offered up by fire, including a minchah; therefore it is written, 'As you do, so shall he do': As you offer blood sacrifices, so they (the converts) too offer blood sacrifices. I might then conclude: As you offer an olah and a shelamim, so shall they also offer an olah and a shelamim; it is therefore

¹ And is regarded as a mechussar kapparah — one who is lacking atonement, and cannot eat kodashim until the blood of his offering is thrown on his behalf.

² I.e., to permit his marriage to a Jewess.

³ I.e., a nazir whose counting has been interrupted by tumah. He is then required to bring an offering and to commence anew the period of nezirus he originally vowed.

⁴ Although it is still incumbent upon him to bring the other.

⁵ I.e., one olah of the cattle can take the place of two birds.

⁶ I.e., as a concession to the poor who cannot afford a sacrifice of cattle, which of course is permissible.

written, 'As you are, so shall the stranger be': He is compared to you, but not wholly concerning your offerings.⁷

Rebbe says: 'As you' means as your forefathers: As your forefathers entered into the covenant only by circumcision, immersion and the sprinkling of the blood, so shall they enter the Covenant only by circumcision, immersion and the sprinkling of the blood.

The offering of one pigeon does not suffice, for we do not find anywhere in the Torah [such an offering]; and the prescription of birds as sacrifices is only a rule towards greater leniency.

Is this indeed so? Has it not been taught: What is the meaning of: and he shall offer it? It reads concerning turtle-doves, 'he shall offer', and I might argue therefore that if a man vows to offer an olah of a bird he shall offer no less than two pigeons, therefore it is written, 'and he shall offer it'. Even one pigeon! — After all, we do not find an obligatory offering of this kind.

But is there not the case of the woman after confinement who offers one young pigeon or one turtle-dove as a chatas? There a lamb is offered in addition.

The Master said: 'As your forefathers entered into the Covenant only etc.'. It is right concerning circumcision, for it is written: For all the people that came out were circumcised, alternatively. And when I passed by you, and saw you wallowing in your blood, I said unto you: In your blood, live, etc.; as to the sprinkling of the blood, it is mentioned in the text: And he sent the young men of the children of Israel [who offered olah offerings and sacrificed shelamims]; but from where do we know the immersion? — It is written: And Moshe took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and there can be no sprinkling without immersion. If so, we should nowadays not receive any converts, since there are no sacrifices today? — Said Rav Acha

son of Yaakov: It is written: And if a stranger sojourn with you, or whoever may be among you, etc.

Our Rabbis taught: A convert in these days has to put aside a fourth [of a shekel] for his sacrifice of birds.⁸ Said Rabbi Shimon: Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai held a vote on this rule and abolished it for fear of misuse.⁹ Said Rav Idi bar Gershom in the name of Rav Adda son of Ahavah: The law is according to Rabbi Shimon.

Some report the latter statement with reference to that which has been taught: A resident alien¹⁰ may do work for himself on the Shabbos in the same measure as an Israelite may do on the intermediate days of the festivals.¹¹ Rabbi Akiva said: as an Israelite on the festival.¹² Rabbi Yosi said: A resident alien may do work for himself on the Shabbos in the same measure as an Israelite on weekdays.¹³ Rabbi Shimon said: Both a resident alien or a resident slave or maidservant may do work for themselves in the same measure as an Israelite may do on weekdays. [Said Rav Idi bar Gershom in the name of Rav Adda son of Ahavah: The law is according to Rabbi Shimon.]

MISHNAH: The following offer a sacrifice for deliberate as well as for inadvertent transgression: one who cohabits with a betrothed slavewoman, a nazir who has become tamei, [one who swore falsely] the oath concerning evidence or the oath concerning a deposit. There are five people who bring one sacrifice for several transgressions, and five who bring a sacrifice of higher or lesser value.¹⁴ The following bring one sacrifice for several transgressions: One who cohabits with a betrothed slavewoman several times, and a nazir who became tamei several times.

GEMARA: From where do we know the law concerning the slavewoman? — Our Rabbis taught: And the Kohen shall make atonement for him with the ram of the asham for his sin which

⁷ I.e., he is not to be equal to you in every respect appertaining to offerings: he does not fulfill his duty by a minchah.

⁸ And keep it ready in case the Temple be rebuilt.

⁹ I.e., that he may not make unlawful use of it.

¹⁰ A ger toshav – a stranger who has renounced idolatry and has taken up residence among the Jews.

¹¹ I.e., he may work on things that would otherwise perish.

¹² I.e., he may do all that is necessary for the preparation of food.

¹³ I.e., he may do all kinds of work.

¹⁴ Viz., according to their means.

he has sinned; this teaches us that one may bring one offering for several sins; and he shall be forgiven for his sin which he has sinned: that deliberate transgression is equal to transgression in error.

A nazir who has become tamei. From where do we know this? — It is written: And if any man die in sudden [be-fesa'] unawareness [pis'om] beside him: fesa' means unintentionally, for thus it is written: But if he thrust him unintentionally [be-fesa'] without enmity; pis'om means unexpectedly, and thus it is written: And Hashem spoke suddenly [pis'om] unto Moshe.

Another [Baraisa] taught: Pis'om means intentionally, and thus it is written: A prudent man sees the evil, and hides himself; but the simple [pesa'im] pass on, and are punished. Why has the text not written just pis'om, which denotes error, intention and accident at the same time: intention and accident as has been explained before; it denotes, however, also error, as it is written: The thoughtless [peshi] believes every word? Why then mention befesa'? — If pis'om alone was mentioned, which denotes both error and intention and accident, I might have thought that an offering nevertheless was brought only for transgression in error, as is the case with all the laws of the Torah, but not in the case of accidental or deliberate transgression; therefore the Divine Law mentions also befesa', which denotes error only, to indicate that pis'om shall denote accident and deliberateness, so that also in these circumstances the Divine Law enjoins an offering.

The oath concerning evidence: From where do we know this? — Our Rabbis have taught: In connection with the other laws the term it being hidden [from him] is used; in connection with this law this term is not used, to indicate that he is liable to an offering for deliberate as well as for inadvertent transgression.

The oath concerning a deposit: From where do we know this? — It is derived from the oath concerning evidence through the common term 'will sin' [secheta].

¹⁵ This effects separate offerings for each transgression.

¹⁶ A nazir who becomes tamei has to count seven clean days and bring an offering on the eighth day. He has then to observe again his vow of nezirus

There are five people who bring one sacrifice for several transgressions: It is stated: One who cohabits with a betrothed slavewoman several times; from where do we know this? — Our Rabbis have taught: And the Kohen shall make atonement for him with the ram of the asham for his sin which he has sinned: this teaches us that one may bring one offering for several sins; 'and he shall be forgiven for his sin which he has sinned': that deliberate transgression is equal to transgression in error. But doesn't the text deal with the deliberate transgression? — Rather say: that transgression in error be equal to deliberate transgression.

Rabbi Chanina of Tirna'ah put the following query to Rabbi Yochanan: If one cohabited with five betrothed slavewomen in one spell of unawareness, is he liable to a sacrifice for each of them or altogether only to one sacrifice? — The latter replied: He is guilty for each of them. And why, the former asked, is this case different from one who cohabited five times with one slavewoman in different spells of unawareness? — He replied: In the case of one slavewoman one cannot argue that there were different bodies; in the instance of the five slavewomen there were different bodies.¹⁵

And From where do we know that the argument of different bodies holds good in the case of the slavewomen? — He replied: Did you not say with reference to forbidden relations that the word 'and a woman' implies that one is guilty for each woman? Also in connection with the slavewoman it is written: And whosoever lies carnally with a woman that is a slavewoman, etc., to enjoin separate offerings for each slavewoman.

A nazir who became tamei several times: Whose view does this represent? — Said Rav Chisda: That of Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Yehudah who holds that the nezirus of taharah counts from the seventh day,¹⁶ and the instance of our Mishnah is realized if he became tamei on the seventh day and then again on the seventh; since the time for the offering was not reached, he is

for the period stipulated, which is called the nezirus of taharah. According to Rabbi Yosi the new period commences on the seventh day. If the nazir becomes tamei again on this day, it is considered a new state of tumah and

liable only to one sacrifice. [How can the instance of the Mishnah be realized] according to Rebbe who holds that the nezirus of taharah does not count before the eighth day? If he became tamei on the seventh day and again on the [following] seventh day, is this not one long period of tumah?¹⁷ If he became tamei on the eighth day and again on the [following] eighth day, since the time of the offering has been reached,¹⁸ he should be liable to an offering for each tumah? It is thus proved that the Mishnah is in accordance with Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Yehudah.

And where do we find Rabbi Yosi's view? — It has been taught: And he shall hallow his head that same day, refers to the day on which the sacrifices are offered¹⁹; thus the words of Rebbe. Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Yehudah says: On the day of the cutting of his hair.²⁰

MISHNAH²¹: One who warns his wife²² in regard to several men, and a metzora who has contracted tzaraas several times.²³ If he has offered the birds and then contracted tzaraas again, they do not count for him until he has offered his chatas.²⁴ Rabbi Yehudah says: until he has offered his asham.

GEMARA: From where do we know the law concerning this? — It is written: This is the law concerning jealousies;²⁵ one law for several warnings.

yet he is liable only to one sacrifice because the offering is due only on the eighth. At the end of another spell of seven days he will then bring one sacrifice for two different occurrences of tumah.

¹⁷ The Mishnah would then not be justified in regarding this as a case where one offering is brought for several separate transgressions or occurrences.

¹⁸ I.e., the offering became due for the first tumah and thus designated for it.

¹⁹ On the eighth day.

²⁰ On the seventh day.

²¹ This is a continuation of the enumeration in the previous Mishnah of laws where one is liable to one sacrifice for several transgressions.

²² Not to have any relations with certain men.

²³ A metzora when declared healed and clean by the Kohen, offers two birds, and after seven days other offerings. If before the offering of the latter sacrifices he contracts again tzaraas, he is not liable to new sacrifices.

²⁴ After the seven days he offers three sacrifices: a chatas, an asham and an olah.

A metzora who has contracted tzaraas several times. From where do we know this? — It is written: This is the law of the metzora: one law for several cases of tzaraas.

The Mishnah had stated: If he has offered the birds and then becomes a metzora again, they do not count for him until he has offered his chatas. Rabbi Yehudah says: Until he has offered his asham. But did you not say he offers only one sacrifice?²⁶ — The text is incomplete, and should read thus: If he has offered the birds and then becomes a metzora again, he offers but one set of sacrifices.

The decision whether the sacrifices be those of the poor person or of the rich person²⁷ is not taken until the chatas is brought.²⁸ Rabbi Yehudah says: Until the asham is brought.

We have learnt there: If a metzora became rich after he had offered his asham, you go by his monetary status at the time of the offering of the chatas; these are the words of Rabbi Shimon. Rabbi Yehudah says: At the time of the offering of the asham.²⁹ It has been taught: Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov says: At the time of the offering of the birds.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: All the three [Rabbis] derive their respective views from the same passage: Whose means suffice not for that which pertains to his cleansing.³⁰ Rabbi Shimon holds: The offering that effects atonement [is

²⁵ The use of the plural implies this law.

²⁶ While the text of the Mishnah seems to imply that he has to offer birds again.

²⁷ The rich person brings three lambs as his sacrifices; the poor person offers a lamb as an asham and then two pigeons or turtle-doves, one for a chatas and one for an olah.

²⁸ I.e., it is the monetary position of the metzora at the time of the offering of the chatas that is decisive, and not at the time of the offering of the birds.

²⁹ I.e., in spite of the fact that he is rich now, he offers but pigeons for the chatas and olos, since he was poor at the moment when the asham was brought.

³⁰ 'To his cleansing' is taken to indicate that the moment of cleansing is decisive, and the three scholars differ as to what is meant by this cleansing: cleansing of sins, cleansing of the impediment to partake of holy things, or that which introduces the process of purification.

decisive]; Rabbi Yehudah holds: That which effects his qualification³¹ [to partake of holy things]; Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov holds: That which effects taharah, namely, the birds.

MISHNAH:³² A woman who has undergone several confinements, e.g., if she produced a female abortion within eighty days of the birth of a girl,³³ and then she produced again a female abortion within eighty days of the first; or if she produced a multiple of abortions.³⁴ Rabbi Yehudah says: She brings an offering for the first birth and not for the second, for the third again but not for the fourth.³⁵

GEMARA: From where do we know this? — A Tanna recited before Rav Sheishes: This is the law for her that bears, whether a male or a female, teaches that she offers but one offering for several births. I might perhaps assume then that also for a birth and a discharge of zivah only one offering is brought, therefore it is written: 'this'.

It states: 'I might perhaps assume then that also for a birth and a discharge of zivah only one offering is brought'. If so,³⁶ she should also bring but one offering if she ate blood and gave birth to a child? — Read thus: I might assume that she also brings but one offering [for two births if] one was before the period of taharah had expired and the other after it had expired;³⁷ therefore it is written, 'this'.

If she produced within eighty days etc. If you will assume that according to Rabbi Yehudah the first birth causes the offering, and the period of tumah is counted from the first birth,³⁸ then according to the Rabbis³⁹ the second birth causes the offering and the second, because there is no period of taharah attached to the latter, since it fell within the period of taharah of the first, an offering has therefore to be brought for the third birth which covers also the fourth that took place within the former's period of taharah.

You say, 'If you will assume'; is it not obvious? — It has to be stated for the sake of its inclusion of the instance of the 'multiple of abortions'. I might have thought that in the case of the multiple of abortions Rabbi Yehudah agrees with the Rabbis; therefore we are informed [that it is not so].

³¹ Viz., the smearing of the blood of the asham upon the thumb.

³² This, too, is a continuation of the enumeration in the second Mishnah of this chapter of laws where one is liable to one sacrifice for several transgressions.

³³ After the birth of a girl the woman counts eighty days of taharah and offers then a sacrifice. The abortion within this period is thus covered by the sacrifice for the first birth.

³⁴ Lit. 'twins'. Each abortion was brought forth before the period of taharah for the previous abortion had expired.

³⁵ An abortion involves a sacrifice only if it takes place at least forty days after the conception. The first abortion took place within eighty days of the proper birth, but the second must of necessity have taken place after that period. It is therefore not covered by the offering brought for the proper birth. The third birth, i.e., the second abortion, cannot be regarded as exempted on account of the fact that it took place within eighty days of the previous birth.

³⁶ Viz., that according to your assumption, one offering should suffice for two instances that are not connected one with the other.

³⁷ Or rather, if the second birth took place after the period of taharah of the first.

³⁸ I.e., whenever a birth takes place within the period of taharah of another, in which case one sacrifice is offered for both, it is the first for which the offering is brought and the second is merely covered by it. The period of taharah is counted from the first birth, so that there is no such period provided for the second.

³⁹ I.e., the anonymous view of the Mishnah which maintains that she is liable only to one sacrifice for all the four births, holding that whenever a birth takes place within the period of taharah of another, it is the second for which the offering is brought while the first becomes exempted owing to the fact that its period of taharah was interrupted. In the instance of the Mishnah, therefore, the second birth takes the place of the first, the third the place of the second, etc. ad infinitum, and the offering is brought for the last of the sequence of births.