

Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf
Temurah Daf 17

9 Adar 5772

March 3, 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

Sacrifices vs. Temurah

The *Mishna* lists the ways that sacrifices are more severe than *temurah* – exchange:

1. One can make a *temurah* from a sacrifice, but not from another *temurah*.
2. A sacrifice can be consecrated by the community and by partners, but *temurah* cannot be done by them.
3. One can consecrate a fetus or limb as a sacrifice, but not as *temurah*.

The *Mishna* then lists the ways that *temurah* is more severe than sacrifices:

1. *Temurah* takes effect on a blemished animal, making it prohibited to work or shear, even if it's redeemed.
2. Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah says that unintentional *temurah* is equivalent to intentional *temurah*, while consecration only takes effect intentionally.

Rabbi Eliezer concludes the *Mishna* by saying that a hybrid, *teriefah*, *tumtum* (whose genitals are covered), *androgynous* animal, or animal born via Caesarean section cannot be consecrated, nor make anything else consecrated.

The *Gemora* explains that Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah says *temurah* applies whether done intentionally or not, since the verse categorically states that the sacrifice and its exchange “will be holy,” including all scenarios equally.

The *Gemora* asks what is meant by unintentional *temurah*, and offers the following answers:

1. One who thought he was allowed to exchange his sacrifice still gets lashes, while one who thought he was allowed to consecrate a blemished animal does not. Another version is that the distinction is in reference to whether his actions take effect – this type of *temurah* takes effect, but a mistaken consecration of a blemished animal does not. (Chizkiyah)
2. One who planned to designate an animal in exchange for an *olah*, but said that it should be an exchange for a *shelamim*. Another version is that he meant to say that the black ox that leaves his house will be a *temurah*, but he said that the white one will be. In these cases of *temurah*, he gets lashes, but if he planned to consecrate a non-blemished animal, but mistakenly consecrated a blemished one, he does not get lashes. (Rabbi Yochanan)
3. One who did not plan to do *temurah*, but instead to say that the sacrifice should lose its status, and the exchange animal should replace it, still gets lashes. However, if one mistakenly ate a blemished sacrifice without redeeming it, he does not get lashes. (Rabbi Yochanan)
4. One who said that he will enter his house, and then follow his plan to sanctify or exchange a sacrifice, but then entered and sanctified or exchanged without remembering his plan. In the case of exchange, he gets lashes, but in the case of sanctifying a blemished animal, he does not.

The *Gemora* discusses Rabbi Eliezer's statement. Shmuel explains that Rabbi Eliezer is saying that these animals cannot themselves be consecrated, nor can one make something else as an exchange of them.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* in which Rabbi Meir asks how one can attempt to make *temurah* from these animals, if they themselves cannot be consecrated.

Rabbi Meir answers with the following cases:

1. *Teriefah* – a healthy animal that was consecrated, and then became a *tereifah*.
2. Born via Caesarean section – one who consecrated a fetus, and it then was born via Caesarean section.
3. Hybrid, *tumtum*, *androgynous* – born from a sacrifice. According to Rabbi Yehudah, who says that one can make a *temurah* from a sacrifice's child, the *Mishna* teaches that these types of child cannot be used to make *temurah*.

Rava explains that Rabbi Eliezer says that just as non-kosher species animals, which cannot be sacrificed, cannot be sanctified, so these animals, which cannot be sacrificed, also cannot be sanctified.

Rav Pappa challenges this from the case of a blemished animal, which cannot be sacrificed, but can be sanctified. Rava answers that it is of a species that can be sacrificed, but Rav Pappa noted that one of the animals listed is a *tereifah*, which is also of a species that can be sacrificed.

Rava answers that a non-kosher species has something inherent in its anatomy making it invalid, unlike a blemished animal, which is just missing something.

Rav Adda challenges this, as some blemishes are also anatomical, like one whose legs are of uneven length, but they still can be sanctified.

Rava answers that a non-kosher species is a different species than anything sacrificed, as opposed to a blemished animal, which is the correct species for a sacrifice. Although a *tereifah* is the correct species, it may not be eaten, like a non-kosher species animal, and unlike a blemished animal, and therefore also cannot be sanctified. (16b – 17a)

Sanctifying a Teriefah

Shmuel says that if one sanctifies a *tereifah*, it is sanctified, and one must wait for it to become blemished to redeem it.

The *Gemora* asks if we can learn from this that one may redeem a sacrifice to feed it to dogs, as we may not eat a *tereifah*.

The *Gemora* therefore revises Shmuel to say that it is sanctified, and we let it die and then bury it.

Rabbi Oshaya says that this is like sanctifying wood and stones, which is just sanctifying their value. We therefore redeem it immediately.

The *Gemora* challenges Shmuel from the *braisa* cited earlier, in which Rabbi Meir says that the only scenario in which a *tereifah* can be sanctified is when a sanctified animal later became a *tereifah*, implying that consecrating a *tereifah* does not take any effect.

Shmuel deflects this, saying that this follows the position that anything that itself cannot be offered does not become sanctified, but Shmuel is following the position that it does become sanctified.

The *Gemora* challenges Shmuel from another *braisa* which states that if a sacrifice became a *tereifah*, one may not redeem it, as that would be redeeming it to feed it to dogs. This implies that if one sanctified them as a *tereifah*, they are not sanctified and may be redeemed.

Shmuel again deflects this, as this *braisa* follows the opinion that anything that is invalid cannot become sanctified.

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, YEISH B'KORBANOS

Temurah and Offsprings

The *Mishna* begins listing the sacrifices whose offspring and exchanges are equivalent to them. The *Mishna* begins with *shelamim*, whose exchanges and offspring, their offspring's offspring, and all generations are also *shelamim*, requiring leaning, libations, and waving the chest and calf, just like standard *shelamim*.

The *Gemora* explains that the *Mishna* listed offspring and their offspring's offspring, but still continued to list "all generations," to accentuate the dispute of this *Mishna* with Rabbi Eliezer, who says that the offspring of a *shelamim* is not offered as a *shelamim*.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* with the source for the *Mishna*'s statements. The verse describing a *shelamim* says that if one offers a *shelamim im zachar, im nekeivah* – if a male,[or] if a female. This extra phrase includes other animals which are offered as a *shelamim* as well. The word *zachar* – male includes an offspring.

The *Gemora* explains that perhaps we should learn this from the fact that an exchange is offered. If an exchange, which is not an offspring of the sacrifice, is offered, certainly the offspring should be offered.

The *Gemora* explains that we can't learn this, as all sacrifices can have an exchange done from them, but not all sacrifices can have an offspring, as only females bear offspring. We therefore need this word to include offspring.

The word *nekeivah* – female teaches that an exchange of a *shelamim* is also offered as a *shelamim*.

Finally, the extra words *im* – *if* in this phrase includes the offspring and exchange of a blemished sacrifice, which are also offered as a *shelamim*.

Rav Safra asked Abaye how we know to learn the offspring from the *zachar* word and the exchange from the *nekeivah* word, and Abaye answered that we learn offspring, which is a masculine word, from the word *zachar* – male, and the exchange, which is a feminine word, from the word *nekeivah* – female. We then extend each phrase to the case of a blemished *shelamim* with its own word *im* – *if*.

The *Gemora* asks what is done with the offspring or exchange of a blemished *shelamim*.

Shmuel says that it is offered. This follows Rabbi Elozar, who says that if one consecrated a female as an *olah* (which is invalid), its male offspring is offered as an *olah*. Shmuel is teaching that Rabbi Elozar says that not only in the case of *olah*, where the mother has the status of an *olah*, but even in the case of a blemished *shelamim*. Bar Padda says that it is sent to graze, until it is blemished, and then redeemed. This is according to both Rabbi Elozar and the Sages.

The *Gemora* says that Rava and Rav Pappa had the same dispute, with Rava following Shmuel, and Rav Pappa following Bar Padda.

The *Gemora* quotes another *braisa*, which cites another source for the *Mishna*. The verse states that “only your sacrifices, that you yourself have, and your pledges, you should carry and come to the Bais Hamikdash. You should offer your *olos*, the meat and the blood, on the altar, and the blood of your *shelamim* should be poured on the altar, and you should eat the meat.” The *braisa* says that the phrase “your sacrifices” includes exchanges, while the phrase “that you have” includes offspring. When the verse mandates that you bring them to the Bais Hamikdash, we may have thought that one brings them and starves them there. The

verse therefore continues to say that “you should offer your *olos*,” teaching that an *olah*'s offspring or exchange is offered exactly like an *olah*. The next phrase, “and the blood of your *shelamim*...” teaches that a *shelamim*'s offspring or exchange is offered exactly like a *shelamim*. Rabbi Yishmael says that the first word, “only”, limits this to *olah* and *shelamim*. Rabbi Akiva says that it isn't necessary, as the verse about *asham* – guilt offering states “it is an *asham*,” implying that only it (the *asham*) is offered, not its offspring or exchange.

The *Gemora* discusses the *braisa* in more depth. Although we know that in five cases of a *chatas*, including exchange and offspring, the animal is starved to death, implying that the exchange and offspring of others are not, we may have thought that these must be put to death in the Bais Hamikdash, while those of *chatas* can be put to death anywhere. The *braisa* therefore says that the verse had to specify that they are offered.

The *Gemora* asks what Rabbi Yishmael excludes with the word “only.” We already know that the exchange or offspring of a *chatas* is put to death, and those of an *asham* are grazed until they get blemished, as the rule is that for any *chatas* case that is put to death, the equivalent *asham* case grazes.

The *Gemora* answers that although we already know what is to be done in the *asham* and *chatas* cases, this verse makes these following these procedures a formal positive commandment, which anyone who offers them violates. (17b – 18a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Unintentional Temurah

The *Gemora* discusses the statement of Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah that unintentional *temurah* is equivalent to intentional *temurah*, offering various cases where this is different than regular consecration.

Tosfos (17a gabai, 2a ha) discusses to what extent they are equivalent. Rabbeinu Baruch says that the text of the *Gemora* is that regarding *temurah*, one receives lashes even for an unintentional violation, while Rabbeinu Shimshon says that the text says that it takes effect, but not that one gets lashes.

Tosfos (17a) notes that in the case of one who thought that he could eat a blemished sacrifice without redemption, the text must say that he thought that one doesn't get lashes. Since it is already sanctified, the text cannot say that “he thought that the sanctification doesn't take effect.”