

Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf
Temurah Daf 15

7 Adar 5772

March 1, 2012

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of
HaRav Refoel Dov ben HaRav Yosef Yechezkel 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.

Visit us on the web at <http://www.daf-yomi.org/>,
where we are constantly updating the archives from the entire Shas.
Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler
To subscribe, please send email to: aneinu@gmail.com

Daily Daf

Offered by Day

When Rav Dimi came (from Eretz Yisroel) he reported that Rabbi Yochanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yehotzadok: It is written: *These shall you make for Hashem in your appointed times.* This refers to the obligatory sacrifices which are offered on the festivals. *Besides your vowed and your donated offerings* teach us that vowed and donated offerings are offered on the Intermediate Days of the Festival (Chol Hamoed). *For your olah offerings:* What type of olah is the verse referring to? It cannot be a vowed olah or a donated olah, for it is already written: *your vowed and your donated offerings.* It must therefore be referring to the olah offerings of a woman brought after childbirth and the olah offering of a metzora. *And for your minchah offerings:* What kind of minchah is the verse referring to? It cannot be a vowed minchah or a donated minchah, for it is already written (*your vowed and your donated offerings*). It must therefore be Referring to a sinner's minchah offering and a minchah of jealousy (*brought by a sotah; both of these minchah offerings are obligatory offerings*). *And for your nesachim and for your shelamim offerings* implies an analogy between nesachim and shelamim, as follows: Just as shelamim are offered by day, so too nesachim (which accompany a sacrifice), are offered by day. *And for your shelamim offerings* includes the shelamim brought by a nazir. [All of the above sacrifices can be brought on Chol Hamoed.]

Abaye said to him: And why not say that the expression includes the shelamim of the korban pesach (If there was a large group for the korban pesach so that it's meat would not

suffice for all present, shelamim offerings (chagigah) were brought with it; and the verse would be teaching us that if these were set aside for that purpose on the fourteenth of Nissan but were not offered up, they could be offered on Chol Hamoed, for according to Abaye, there is no need for the Torah to include the shelamim of a nazir, as the Gemora will now explain), for the verse cannot be coming to include the shelamim offerings of a nazir, for they are sacrifices which are the subject of a vow or a donated offering (and therefore are already included in the previous verse: your vowed offerings and your donated offerings). (14b)

Nazir's Offerings

[The Gemora proves that the shelamim of a nazir is regarded as a vowed or donated offering from the following Mishna:] This is the general rule: Whatever is the subject of a donated or vowed offering may be offered on a private bamah, and whatever is not the subject of a donated or vowed offering must not be offered on a private bamah. And it has been taught in a braisa: minchah offerings and offerings in connection with a nazir may be offered on a private bamah; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. [We see that the shelamim of a nazir is regarded as a donated or vowed offering, and that is why it may be offered on a private bamah. This is so because the nazir makes a vow to declare his nezirus, and then he becomes liable to bring these korbanos.]

The Gemora answers: Remove from here the case of a nazir (for he cannot bring his offerings on a bamah; this is so

because they are not brought as a direct result of his vow; he brings them because that is a nazir's obligation).

The *Gemora* asks: But is there anyone who holds that a *nazir's* offerings are not the subject of a vow or a donated offering? Behold it is written: *And it came to pass at the end of forty years that Avshalom said to the king: I will go now and fulfill my vow (of nezirus) in Chevron.* Now does this not refer to the sacrifice (and if it does, it will be a proof that a *nazir* can bring his offerings on a private *bamah*)?

The *Gemora* answers that (it does not refer to where he will offer these sacrifices, rather) it refers to the vow itself. [Chevron is where he made the vow; the sacrifices, however, will be offered in Giveon, the location of the communal *bamah*.]

The *Gemora* asks: Wasn't his vow made in Geshur (*in Aram*)?

Rav Acha, and some say Rabbah the son of Rav Chanan said: Avshalom only went in order to bring sheep from Chevron (*for there the fattest sheep could be found*).

The *Gemora* notes that this answer seems reasonable, for if you would say that he went to Chevron to offer his sacrifices, would it make sense that he would leave Jerusalem (*where the Holy Ark was located*) and go offer them in Chevron?

The *Gemora* asks: If he went to bring the sheep from Chevron, the verse ought to say 'from Chevron' (not 'in Chevron')!?

The *Gemora* answers: In truth he went to offer the sacrifices in Chevron (*and it would prove that a nazir's sacrifices may be brought on a private bamah, so nazir should not be removed from R' Meir's ruling*), and regarding your difficulty as to why he left Jerusalem and came to offer them in Chevron, the same difficulty could be raised with reference to Giveon, which was a holy place (*why would he not offer them there, the place where Moshe's altar was located*)!? The answer is that once it has become permissible to offer on the private altars, one may offer wherever he wishes.

The verse mentioned above stated: *After forty years (And it came to pass at the end of forty years that Avshalom said to the king etc.)* The *Gemora* asks: Forty years from what?

The *Gemora* answers by citing a *braisa*: Rabbi Nehorai said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua: It was forty years from when the Israelites requested a king, for it has been taught in a different

braisa: The year in which the Israelites requested a king was the tenth year of Shmuel's leadership. [Avshalom's rebellion against David, his father, began forty years after this event. The *Gemora* does not prove this, but Rashi explains that there was no other event that occurred for which we can count forty years from then.] Shmuel himself ruled for ten years. There was one year in which both Shaul and Shmuel ruled, and two years in which Shaul himself ruled, and thirty-six years in which David reigned (totaling forty years). [We have therefore thirteen years for Shmuel and Shaul after the death of Eli the Kohen Gadol until David, and David ruled thirty-six years, up to the rebellion of Avshalom. We have thus forty-nine years. Deduct from this nine years for Shmuel's leadership before the Israelites requested a king, and we find that when Avshalom revolted, it was forty years since the Israelites had requested a king.] (14b – 15a)

Mishna

A *chatas* of an individual whose owners have procured atonement (*from a different animal, for he lost the original animal*) is left to die (*after it is found; it is starved to death*), whereas that of the public is not left to die (*for the Oral tradition passed down from Sinai is that there are five chatas offerings, of which this is one, which are left to die, but only by individual sacrifices*). Rabbi Yehudah, however, says: It is left to die.

Rabbi Shimon said: Just as we find with regard to the offspring of a *chatas*, the *temurah* of a *chatas*, and a *chatas* whose owners died that the laws concerning them apply only to an individual sacrifice but not to a communal offering (*for communal offerings are male and the 'offspring of a chatas' cannot apply, and temurah does not take effect with any communal offering, and the owners of a public chatas cannot die (as the Gemora will explain)*), so too the laws concerning the *chatas* whose owners have procured atonement and a *chatas* whose year has passed apply only to an individual sacrifice but not to a communal offering. [Although these last two cases can apply by a communal offering, nevertheless, R' Shimon holds that if three of these five cases can only apply to an individual sacrifice, that is an indicator that the laws governing these five cases are applicable only to individual sacrifices, and not to communal offerings.] (15a)

Chatas Left to Die

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: From where do we derive that if one consecrated a *chatas* and it became lost and he designated another animal in its place and the first animal was then found, and both are standing before us, from where do we derive that he may bring whichever one he chooses? It is written: *and a chatas he shall bring*. One might think that he may bring both of them, the verse therefore states: *he shall bring it*, implying one but not two.

The *Gemora* asks: And what becomes of that second *chatas*?

Rav Hamnuna said: It has been taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Yehudah says: It is left to graze (*until it develops a blemish; it is then sold and the proceeds are used for an olah*), whereas Rabbi Shimon says: It is left to die.

The *Gemora* asks: But does Rabbi Yehudah hold that it is left to graze? Have we not learned in our *Mishna* that Rabbi Yehudah maintains that it is left to die? [*If he holds that it is left to die even in the case of a communal chatas, how much more so then, in the case of a chatas of an individual!*]

The *Gemora* answers: Reverse the names in the above *braisa* as follows: Rabbi Yehudah says: It is left to die, whereas Rabbi Shimon says: It is left to graze.

The *Gemora* asks: But does Rabbi Shimon hold that it is left to graze? Didn't Rabbi Shimon say: Five *chatas* offerings are left to die? [*The Oral tradition passed down from Sinai is that there are five chatas offerings that are left to die: 1. The offspring of a chatas; 2. Temurah of a chatas; 3. The owner of the chatas died; 4. The owner of the chatas received atonement through a different korban; 5. The chatas went passed its year.*]

The *Gemora* answers: Rather you do not need to reverse the names of the *braisa* above, and yet, there is no difficulty. The *braisa* is referring to a case where the first *chatas* was lost when the second animal was separated for a *chatas* (*but was found before it was offered; in such a case it is left to graze, for the Tradition was not passed down in such a case*), and the *Mishna* is dealing with a case where the first *chatas* was lost at the time of the atonement (*and the Tradition passed down is that such an animal is condemned to die*).

Alternatively, you may answer that in both cases we suppose that the first *chatas* was lost when the second animal was separated for a *chatas* (*but was found before it was offered*), and yet there is no difficulty, for the *Mishna* is reflecting the opinion of Rabbi Yehudah according to Rebbe (*who holds that if the first offering is lost at the time of the separation of the second animal, although it is found before atonement is obtained by means of the second animal, the first chatas is left to die*), and the *braisa* is following the opinion of Rabbi Yehudah according to the Rabbis (*who disagrees with Rebbe, and holds that the Tradition passed down that a chatas is left to die only applies after the owners had procured atonement by means of the second animal*).

The *Gemora* asks (*on the opinion of R' Yehudah cited in our Mishna*): But is there anyone who holds that a communal *chatas* whose owners procured atonement is left to die? Has the following not been taught in a *braisa*: Similarly (*that a chatas can be completely burnt on the altar like an olah*), said Rabbi Yosi: *The children of the captivity, that were coming out of exile, brought olah offerings to the God of Israel, twelve bulls, ninety-six rams, seventy-seven sheep, twelve he-goats as a chatas; all of them as an olah offering*. Is it possible that all of them were *olah* offerings (*when the verse expressly states that there were twelve goats were chatas*)? Can a *chatas* be offered as an *olah*?! Rather, this is the meaning: They were like an *olah*; just as an *olah* must not be eaten, so too the *chatas* was not eaten.

The *braisa* continues (*and explains why the chatas offerings were completely burned*): For Rabbi Yosi used to say: They brought the twelve he-goats for the sin of idolatry. [*The Torah writes that when all of Israel commits adultery, each tribe brings a he-goat for a chatas (and a bull for an olah), and it is treated as an olah.*] And Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: This was on account of the idolatry which they committed in the time of Tzidkiyahu (*which took place in the time before the exile*). Now, assuming that the one who holds that a communal *chatas* whose owners procured atonement is left to die, holds that a *chatas* whose owners have died is also left to die, is there not here a case where the owners have died (*for they died during the seventy years of captivity in Bavel*), and yet the *chatas* is nevertheless offered!

Rav Pappa answers: Even according to the one who holds that a communal *chatas* whose owners have procured atonement is left to die, a communal *chatas* whose owners have died is not left to die, for a community does not die (*since the atonement is based upon the community, and although the*

people may have died, the community did not; accordingly, those returning from captivity can bring a chatas for the community that sinned years beforehand).

The Gemora asks: From where does Rav Pappa derive this? It cannot be based upon the verse which says: In place of your fathers shall be your sons (*indicating that children can bring the offerings of their fathers*), for if this would be so, the same should apply to the sacrifice of an individual!?

The Gemora notes that the source that the community does not die is the following: We find by the he-goats brought on festivals and every *Rosh Chodesh*, where the Torah says: Bring them from the funds of the Temple Treasury (*indicating that they are communal offerings*); but perhaps some of the owners of these coins have died (*and yet, we still bring the sacrifices*)!? Does this not prove that a community does not die?

The Gemora suggests an alternative answer as to how those sacrifices were brought upon returning from exile (*even if we would hold that a community does die*): I may say that when these chatas offerings were brought, they were offered on behalf of those still alive. This is based upon the verse that says: *But many of the Kohanim and Levi'im and heads of families, the elders that had seen the first Temple on its foundation of this house, wept with a loud voice when this Temple was in front of their eyes, while many shouted aloud in joy.*

The Gemora proves that the survivors were even a majority, for the verse continues: *The people could not discern the sound of the joyful shouting because of the noise of the weeping of the people.*

The Gemora asks: But how could they bring a sacrifice for idolatry? Were they not deliberate sinners (*of idolatry in the days of Tzidkiyahu, and the sacrifices prescribed in the Torah are only for those who sinned unintentionally*)?

Rabbi Yochanan answers: It was a special ruling of the moment.

The Gemora notes that it is reasonable to say like this, for otherwise, how could we explain to what all those sheep and rams correspond to (*for the bulls and he-goats correspond to the twelve tribes*); it must be that it was a special ruling of the moment. (15a – 15b)

DAILY MASHAL

“And Timna was a concubine (of Esav)”

This verse alludes to the law of the five chatas offerings, which based upon a Tradition from Moshe at Sinai, are condemned to death.

The offspring of a chatas	וְלֹד חַטָּאת	ו
Temurah of a chatas	תְּמִירַת חַטָּאת	ת
The owner of the chatas died	מָתוּ בְעֹלֶיהָ	מ
The owner of the chatas received atonement through a different korban	וַתִּכְפְּרוּ בְעֹלֶיהָ בְּאַחֶרֶת	נ
The chatas went passed its year	עָבְרָה שְׁנָתָהּ	ע

The question begs to be asked: Why did Timna merit having her name used as a mnemonic for the five "Chatos Ha'meisos?"

I noticed from Rabbi Zvi Fleisher from Toronto a beautiful answer as follows: The five Chatos are all cases of an animal having the sanctity of a sacrifice capable of providing atonement which was not used, where instead another chatas was used, or another manner of atonement was achieved. The Hadar Z'keinim mentioned the story of Timna's dissuading Amalek from attempting to kill Yaakov by advising him that if he would be successful, the burden of suffering for many generations as slaves in Egypt would fall onto his family. She saved Yaakov from possibly being killed. The exile of Egypt was an atonement for a shortcoming of Avrohom as mentioned in the Gemora Nedorim 32b. There was the possibility of the atonement being achieved by either Yaakov's or Eisov's descendants. Timna, in her saving Yaakov's life, said to Amalek that his family should not be the one to bring about the atonement, but rather that Yaakov's should. It is therefore most befitting that she has a place in our Torah study by the subject of atonement not being achieved with the five chatas offerings, where the sinner receives his atonement through another means. These five chatas offerings are instead put to death. Correspondingly, may the descendents of Amalek have a "kein yovdu kol oi'vecho Hashem" "So all the enemies of HaShem should be destroyed (Shoftim 5:31).