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

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: The mother of Rav Huna bar Sechorah was privileged to have a son who explained [Rava's ruling] on [the Sabbath previous to] a Festival[1] in line with Raba's teaching.[2]

MISHNAH: If two [lambs] came forth at the same time,[3] he counts them in pairs.[4] If he counted [the two][5] as one, the ninth and the tenth are impaired.[6] [If the ninth and the tenth came out at the same time, the ninth and the tenth are impaired.][7] If he called the ninth the tenth, the tenth the ninth and the eleventh the tenth, the three are holy. The ninth is eaten while

blemished, the tenth is the tithe and the eleventh is sacrificed as a shelamim, and it can effect a substitute.[8] These are the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehudah said: Can that one substitute effect another substitute?[9] They said in the name of Rabbi Meir: If it[10] were a substitute, it would not have been sacrificed.[11] If he called the ninth the tenth, the tenth the tenth and the eleventh the tenth, the eleventh is not consecrated.[12] The following is the rule: Wherever the name of the tenth [animal] has not been eliminated from it,[13] the eleventh is not consecrated.[14]

---

[1] Where there was a large public present to hear the exposition of the regulations of the forthcoming Festival.

[2] When he says above: Thus (the remaining lamb) is fit to combine etc., which is the principle which Rava adopts, namely that of a counting properly begun.

[3] When he commenced to count them two came forth simultaneously through the width of the door.

[4] And the tenth pair are holy. The same applies if they passed through in threes, fours etc.

[5] E.g., when he reached the sixth or the seventh.

[6] As regards offering up on the altar, for the ninth, according to his counting, is really the tenth and the tenth is really the eleventh. Consequently, the animals are condemned to pasture until blemished. The case here also is unlike the case of one who called the tenth the ninth and the eleventh the tenth, when the tenth is the tithe and the eleventh is offered up as a shelamim, because since he counted the animals one by one it is clear that the animal he called the ninth was really the tenth, the mistake being on his part. The tenth is holy therefore without the slightest doubt, and the eleventh is also holy as the result of a Divine decree, as mentioned below. But where a pair came out in the beginning simultaneously, and instead of counting them in pairs, he counted them singly, it was not absolutely clear that the animal which he counted the ninth would be the tenth.

[7] As regards being offered up as tithe, for it is impossible to ascertain which came forth first and is consequently the tithe. Hence since we are in doubt

which passed through, first both must pasture and are eaten when blemished.

[8] It can transfer its holiness to another animal substituted for it.

[9] Because he maintains that the holiness of the eleventh animal is due to the fact that it is a substitute. For when he called the eleventh the tenth, it is as if he had said: 'Let this be holy instead of the tenth' and that which is already a substitute etc.

[10] The eleventh animal which he called the tenth.

[11] The eleventh is not the substitute for the tenth, for had it been a substitute it would not have been offered up, for Scripture says: You shall not redeem, they are holy). And we deduce thus: They (themselves) are holy but not their substitutes. And although the text refers to the first-born, we derive the case of tithe therefrom (Rashi). The fact that the eleventh is offered up as a shelamim proves therefore that it cannot be a substitute and that its holiness is in its own right.

[12] Since sometimes the eleventh can receive the comparatively stringent holiness of a shelamim, when, for example, he made a mistake and called the tenth the ninth, then in this case when he called the tenth the tenth, the eleventh receives no holiness at all. The ninth, however, will retain the minor holiness of not being eaten unless blemished, even where he called the tenth the tenth.

[13] I.e., when he called the tenth the tenth and thus there was a proper tithe.

[14] Although he called it the tenth.

GEMARA: Rabbi Yochanan said: If he counted [the lambs] in pairs or in hundreds; the tenth in his counting becomes holy. In what counting? — Rav Mari says: The holiness of the tenth is determined by his counting,[15] whereas Rav Kahana says: The holiness of the tenth is determined by the actual number of animals.[16]

We have learned: If two came out at the same time, he counts them in pairs. If he counted [the two] as one, the ninth and the tenth are impaired. Now there is no difficulty according to the one who holds: The holiness of the tenth is determined by his counting; for this reason the ninth and the tenth are impaired, and he calls the tenth the ninth and the eleventh the tenth.[17] But according to the one who holds that the holiness of the tenth is determined by the actual number of the animals, it is as if he called the [certain] ninth the ninth and the [certain] tenth the tenth![18] Rabbi Yochanan can reply thus: I only say [that the holiness of the tenth is determined by the counting of the animals] where he planned to bring them out in pairs, but where [as in the Mishnah] they came out [of the shed] of themselves, it is not so.[19]

Come and hear: If he counted them backwards,[20] the tenth of the counting is holy. Now I grant that according to the one who holds that the holiness of the tenth is determined by the actual number of the animals, there would be no difficulty. But

according to the one who maintains that the holiness of the tenth is determined by his counting, then he calls the tenth the first![21] — Said Rava: The reason is because it so happens that in the Persian system of counting that they call ten one.[22]

The Mishnah had stated: If he called the ninth the tenth, the tenth the ninth and the eleventh the tenth etc. Our Rabbis taught: From where do we know that if he called the ninth the tenth, the tenth the ninth and the eleventh the tenth, the three are consecrated? The text states: And concerning the tithe of the herd or of the flock even of whatever passes under the rod the tenth shall be holy, thus including all.[23] One might have thought that I include also the eighth and the twelfth.[24] [Against this] you can argue thus: Since it [the tenth] is holy and [the animal] he by mistake [called the tenth] is consecrated, just as [the tenth] is only consecrated when it is next [to it],[25] similarly [the animals] he by mistake called [the tenth] must be next to it.[26]

But has it not been taught: Just as the tenth can only be one,[27] similarly [the animal] called by mistake [the tenth] can only be one?[28] — A teacher of Baraisos recited before Rabbi Yochanan: [This Baraisa] will represent the opinion of Rabbi Elozar ben Shimon. For it has been taught: Rabbi Elozar ben Shimon says: The eleventh is holy only when he is silent at the ninth,[29] calls

---

[15] In the case of pairs, therefore, the tenth pair is holy as tithe, and in the case of the counting of hundreds, the tenth hundred is holy.

[16] We are not concerned with his counting, and therefore in the case of pairs, the tenth animal becomes holy as tithe of itself and every tenth animal of the hundred becomes holy, making ten animals as tithes in every hundred. If, therefore, the tithes can be recognized it is well, and if not, they are all condemned until they are blemished.

[17] There is some holiness in the eleventh, his naming it as the tenth having this effect.

[18] For the fact that he called the tenth the ninth and the eleventh the tenth makes no difference, and therefore why shouldn't the tenth be the tithe and the eleventh a shelamim?

[19] That we go according to the actual number of the animals, but the tithe also depends on the way he counts.

[20] E.g., the first he called the tenth, the second the ninth, the third the eighth etc.

[21] He then calls the tenth animal the first, and if therefore we are guided by what he says why should the last animal be sacred, since he actually calls it the first?

[22] Counting only the Units. Therefore what he calls the first is in fact the tenth.

[23] Implying that it is the tithe whether he called it the tenth or it was the actual tenth, even though he did not call it tithe.

[24] If he called them the tenth, that they are sacred.

[25] And what can be nearer to the tenth animal than the very animal itself?

[26] Viz., the ninth or the eleventh which is the next one, before or after the tenth.

[27] For obviously the tenth can only be one animal.

[28] So that if he made a mistake in calling the ninth and the eleventh the tenth, both are not consecrated but only one. How then can you say that all are consecrated?

[29] When he did not call it the tenth, for had he done so the eleventh would not have been holy, as then he would have made two mistakes.

the tenth the ninth, and the eleventh the tenth.[30] He [Rabbi Elozar] concurs with Rabbi Yehudah who said: A mistake in counting the animal for tithes renders [the animal styled tenth] as a substitute,[31] and he also holds the opinion of his father [Rabbi Shimon] who said: No substitute can effect another substitute.[32]

Rava said: If two came out of the shed at the ninth[33] and he called them the ninth, the tenth and chullin are mixed together.[34] The tenth is sacred on its own accord.[35] And the ninth [is chullin] because he called it the ninth. If he called them[36] the tenth, the tenth and the ninth are mixed together.[37] What is the reason? Because he called them both the tenth. If two came out [of the shed] at the tenth[38] and he called them the tenth, the tenth and the eleventh are mixed together.[39] If he called them[40] the eleventh, the tenth and chullin are mixed together.[41] What need is there [for Rava] to give this additional ruling?[42] Is it not the same?[43] — He informs us of this, that wherever they came out at the same time and he called them

the tenth they are consecrated, although the name of the tenth was not eliminated from it.[44]

Rav Kahana sat and was stating this tradition. Rav Ashi said to Rav Kahana: But the name of the tenth has not been eliminated from it, and we have learned: The following is the rule: Wherever the name of the tenth has not been eliminated from it the eleventh is not consecrated?[45] — This is the case[46] only when [the lambs] came out one after the other,[47] but where they came out simultaneously,[48] both are holy.[49]

But isn't the case [where he called the tenth and the eleventh] one after the other [the tenth] explicitly stated: If he called the ninth the tenth, the tenth the tenth and the eleventh the tenth, the eleventh is not consecrated? Now what does the statement 'the following is the rule' include? Does it not include the case where he called the tenth and the eleventh simultaneously the tenth?[50] — No. It includes the case where the tenth came out and he did not say anything,[51] for here the name of the tenth was not eliminated from it.[52] For if you will not agree to this,[53]

---

[30] There being only one mistake here viz., calling the eleventh the tenth, because calling the tenth the ninth is no mistake, since the tenth automatically becomes consecrated.

[31] The animal marked as the tenth by mistake is deemed sacred as a substitute, and having therefore made the ninth a tenth, the eleventh can no more become a substitute, as Rabbi Yehudah says in the Mishnah above.

[32] And similarly here two mistakes, viz., calling the ninth the tenth and the eleventh the tenth, do not confer holiness on the two animals in substitution for the holiness of the tenth.

[33] When the ninth was about to go out.

[34] And they must not be eaten unless in a blemished state and if he shears or works one of the animals, he is not liable to lashes since it may be chullin.

[35] Although he has not called it the tenth.

[36] The two animals which left the shed together when about to go out.

[37] They are both therefore holy, and if he redeemed or sold one of them he is liable to lashes, for he called them both the tenth, and the owners can eat them only while they are blemished.

[38] When the tenth animal was about to go out.

[39] The tenth is actually the tithe and the eleventh is a shelamim. Therefore both are sacrificed and are eaten subject to the restriction applying to each, viz., two sprinklings of blood and the separation of the breast and shoulder for the Kohen.

[40] The two lambs which came out of the shed when the tenth was about to go out.

[41] And both are eaten while blemished by their owners without redemption.

[42] Where the two came forth as the tenth was about to go out, that the tenth and the eleventh are mixed together.

[43] Could I not have inferred that the tenth and the eleventh are mixed together from the ruling of the tenth and the ninth which are considered as mixed together?

[44] Since he also called the tenth the tenth.

[45] Viz., where he called the tenth the tenth. Therefore how can the eleventh be holy here, since he called the tenth the tenth?

[46] That we require the name of the tenth to be eliminated from it.

[47] And since he called the tenth the tenth, the eleventh is not holy.

[48] And he called both the tenth and the eleventh the tenth.

[49] Even the eleventh.

[50] And even so the eleventh is not holy.

[51] He did not call it the tenth, and yet the eleventh which subsequently came out and which he called the tenth is not holy, because the tenth becomes holy in its own accord, the silence not being considered the elimination of the name of the tenth from it.

[52] But where both came out of the shed at the same time and he called the tenth and the eleventh the tenth, they are both holy.

[53] That if they came out simultaneously they are holy.

what of this which has been taught: If two came out at the tenth[54] one not preceding the other, and he called them the tenth, the tenth and eleventh are mixed together [viz., tithe and a shelamim]. [Now why is this, seeing that] the name of the tenth has not been here eliminated from it?[55] Must not we say therefore that wherever both came out [of the shed] at the same time they are consecrated? — Were it only for this, there would be no proof, because the case here[56] is where one put forth its head before the other and he called it the eleventh,[57] and subsequently, it mixed with the others [and two animals] came out together and he called them the tenth, the name of the tenth having thus been eliminated from it.[58]

But doesn't [the Baraisa] state above: 'One not preceding the other'? — The phrase 'One not preceding the other' means that it afterwards mixed with the others.[59]

And whose opinion does this[60] represent? Not that of Rebbe, for if that of Rebbe, does he not say: The [calling of] the eleventh [before the tenth] is not considered as eliminating [the name of the tenth]? — You may even say that this represents the opinion of Rebbe, for Rebbe's ruling refers only to a case where he has many animals to tithe, for then we say that he means 'one [group of] ten'.[61] But here we are referring to a case where he has no more animals.[62]

What is this ruling of Rebbe? — As it has been taught: If he called the tenth the eleventh[63] and the eleventh the tenth, the eleventh is not sacred. There are the words of Rebbe. Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Yehudah says: The eleventh is sacred. Rebbe stated a rule: So long as the name of the tenth has not been eliminated from it,[64] the eleventh is not holy. [But hasn't [the name of the tenth] been eliminated]? — Said Rava: What are the circumstances here? Where he has many animals and we say that he means one ten.

---

[54] When the tenth was about to go out.

[55] Because he called the tenth the tenth.

[56] In the Baraisa which says that the tenth and the eleventh are mixed together and we regard the eleventh as consecrated, although he called the tenth the tenth.

[57] Thus removing the name of the tenth from it, since he did not call it the tenth but the eleventh. Where he called it the ninth, there is no question that this is eliminating the name of the tenth, but the Baraisa wishes to inform us that even if he called it the eleventh, although this is not the view of Rabbi below, it is also regarded as removing the name of the tenth.

[58] And therefore the eleventh is holy. But where he first called them the tenth, although they came out together, it may be that the eleventh is not consecrated.

[59] And then both animals actually came out at the same time, one not preceding the other.

[60] The ruling which says that if he calls the tenth the eleventh it is regarded as eliminating the name of the tenth from it.

[61] achad asar (eleven) lit., 'one ten' may signify (by dividing the words) 'one (group) of ten', and meaning: this is the first tenth, the first ten animals that have been tithed. Therefore by calling the tenth achad asar he has not really eliminated the name of the tenth from it according to Rebbe.

[62] Than eleven, or twelve or thirteen, or fifteen. We cannot therefore explain the words achad asar as meaning the first ten, as this would imply that he has more tens of animals to tithe. In this instance, consequently, he must actually mean to call the animal the eleventh, and even Rebbe will admit here that the calling of the tenth the eleventh eliminates the name of the tenth from it.

[63] Before he called the tenth.

[64] I.e., where he called the tenth the tenth.