



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

**Temurah of an Asham**

The *braisa* had stated: Rabbi Akiva says that it isn't necessary (*to derive that the temurah of other sacrifices are not offered*) etc. (*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* asks: What need is there for the text? Is there not an Oral Tradition that teaches this to us (*for the Tradition taught was that for any chatas case that is put to death (such as a temurah or its offspring), the equivalent asham case grazes until it develops a blemish*)?

The *Gemora* answers: Yes indeed, that is so. The Scriptural text, however, is required for Rav Huna's teaching, for Rav Huna said: If an *asham* is put out to graze (*i.e. in a case where its owner died*) and it was then slaughtered as a *korban* without specific intent for what *korban* it should be, it is valid (*as an olah, as this is its intended purpose*).

The *Gemora* asks: This implies that it is only true if it was officially put out to graze and removed from being an *asham*. Why should it depend on whether or not it was removed?

The *Gemora* answers: The verse says: *it is an asham* implying it stays an *asham* until it is taken away from being an *asham*. (18a)

**Temurah and Offspring of Shelamim**

[The *braisa* above cites two opinions for the law that the *temurah* and offspring of a *shelamim* are offered on the altar. One *Tanna* derived it from the verse: *im zachar, im nekevah – whether it be a male,[or] if a female*, and the other *Tanna* learned that the phrase “*your sacrifices*” includes exchanges, while the phrase “*that you have*” includes offspring, and the phrase “*you shall take and come*” teaches that they are offered on the altar. The *Gemora* now will explain what each *Tanna* does with the verse used by his counterpart.]

The *Gemora* asks: And according to the *Tanna* who derives it from these Scriptural verses, why not derive it from the text: *whether it be a male or a female*?

The *Gemora* answers: That is required to teach the cases of the offspring of blemished animals and the *temurah* of blemished animals (*that they are offered upon the altar*).

The *Gemora* asks: But why not derive all these cases (*the offspring of unblemished and blemished animals, and the temurah of an unblemished and of a blemished animal*) from this text (*specifically from the word ‘whether’ which precedes ‘male or female’*)?

The *Gemora* answers: The phrase ‘*whether*’ does not teach anything according to him.

The *Gemora* asks: And the *Tanna* who derives the law from the text: ‘*whether it be a male or female,*’ what does he do with the verse: *You shall take and come*?

The *Gemora* answers: This teaches us that sacrifices should be brought even from their pastures. [*When the festival has arrived, one is obligated to go to the Temple and bring along all offerings that he possesses. He must not say that he will not trouble to collect the animals which have wandered to distant pastures and that he will wait for another occasion to offer them, but he must take the animals with him then and offer them.*]

The *Gemora* cites another version: One is required to bring them even if he needs to take them away from their threshing (*while they are working*; *Rashi* notes that the *Gemora* is referring to an animal which he intends to consecrate – *for otherwise, he would not be allowed to work with the animal*). (18a)

## Mishna

Rabbi Eliezer says: The offspring of a *shelamim* is not offered as a *shelamim* (as a Rabbinical decree, which will be explained in the *Gemora*). The Sages, however, say that it may be offered.

Rabbi Shimon said: There is no dispute between them regarding the offspring of the offspring of a *shelamim*, or the offspring of the offspring of a *temurah* that they are not offered; the point at issue between them is the case of the offspring (of a *shelamim*). Rabbi Eliezer says that it may not be offered, whereas the Sages say that it may be offered.

Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Papayas testified that the offspring of a *shelamim* should be brought as a *shelamim*. Rabbi Papayas testified that we had a cow which was a *shelamim* and we ate it on *Pesach*, and we ate its offspring on *Sukkos*. (18a)

## 'Im' or 'Eim'?

Rabbi Ami said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: Rabbi Eliezer's reason is as follows: It is written: *And if (ve'im) his offering is a shelamim*. We interpret the word *ve'im* (meaning: and if) as *ve'eim* (meaning: and the mother), thus excluding the offspring.

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said to Rabbi Ami: If this is so, then let us consider the following verse: *if (im) he offers it for a todah*. Here as well, shall we interpret the 'im' as 'eim' (meaning mother), thus excluding the offspring? And you cannot say that this is so, for it has been taught in a *braisa*: From where do we know that its offspring, its *temurah* and its replacement (of a *todah*) are all offered? It is written: *if he offers it for a todah* - in any case!?

Rather, Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: Rabbi Eliezer's reason is as follows: It is forbidden to offer the offspring (of a *shelamim*) lest we rear flocks upon flocks of them. [If you say that the offspring of a *shelamim* may be offered, he may detain the mother in order to give birth, and all future offspring can be used as sacrifices. There is therefore the risk that the animal may be shorn or worked. Regarding the *todah*, however, the Rabbis did not decree, for this kind of sacrifice is not so frequent, for it is only brought when one is saved from danger.] (18a)

## Offspring of the Offspring

The *Mishna* had stated: Rabbi Shimon said: There is no dispute between them (regarding the offspring of the offspring of a *shelamim*,

or the offspring of the offspring of a *temurah* that they are not offered; the point at issue between them is the case of the offspring of a *shelamim*). [The *Gemora* will present two ways to understand R' Shimon's statement. The focus will be on the phrase 'that they are not offered.' According to the first way of understanding, R' Shimon said as follows: There is no dispute between them regarding the offspring of the offspring of a *shelamim* that they are not offered, for they all maintain that the second-generation offspring is offered. According to the second way of understanding, R' Shimon said as follows: There is no dispute between them regarding the offspring of the offspring of a *shelamim* that they are not offered, for they all maintain that the second-generation offspring is not offered.]

They inquired: What does the *Mishna* mean (regarding the offspring of the offspring): There is no dispute between them that they are not offered, rather, they all agree that they are offered (and the reason would be that people forget where they came from, and therefore there is no fear that others will see that these are offered and will retain their *shelamim* in order to rear flocks), or perhaps there is no dispute between them that they are offered, rather, they all agree that they are not offered (as the *Gemora* will explain below).

Rabbah said: It is reasonable to assume that the *Mishna's* meaning is that there is no dispute between them that they are not offered, rather, they all agree that they are offered. The reason is as follows: Rabbi Eliezer only disagrees with the Sages in the case of the offspring of the *shelamim* itself, but regarding the offspring of the offspring of the *shelamim*, it is a chance happening (for it is unusual that he will detain the mother for such a long period, and therefore there is no reason for a decree in such a case, and all agree that it may be offered).

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, however, disagrees and says: There is no there is no dispute between them that they are offered, rather, they all agree that they are not offered. The reason is as follows: The Sages disagree with Rabbi Eliezer only in the case of the offspring of the *shelamim* itself, but regarding the offspring of the offspring of the *shelamim*, one can discern from his actions that he intends to rear them (for he delayed bring the *shelamim* and he has two generations of offspring from it; therefore, they agree that there are grounds for the decree against offering them).

Rabbi Chiya taught a *braisa* in support of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi: It is written: *If he brings a lamb (as a shelamim)*, implying that the first offspring (a *lamb*) is offered, but the second offspring is not offered. [This reflects R' Yehoshua ben Levi's opinion that the Sages agree to R' Eliezer that the second-generation offspring of a *shelamim* is not



offered.] *It* (a offspring of a *shelamim*) is offered, but not the offspring of any other *kodashim*.

Ravina explains the last clause of the *braisa* teaches us that the offspring of a *ma'aser* animal is not offered. The *braisa* could not have been referring to the offspring of an *olah* or an *asham*, for those offerings are always male, and it could not be referring to the offspring of a *chatas*, for we have learned through an Oral Tradition that the offspring of a *chatas* is left to die. (18a – 18b)

### **Delaying the Offspring**

The *Mishna* had stated: Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Papayas testified etc. (that the offspring of a *shelamim* should be brought as a *shelamim*. Rabbi Papayas testified that we had a cow which was a *shelamim* and we ate it on *Pesach*, and we ate its offspring on the *Chag*).

The *Gemora* asks: And according to Rava who holds that one who vows to bring a *korban* and has not brought it after one festival has violated a positive commandment (against *delaying*), why wasn't the animal eaten on *Shavuos*? [The *Gemora* understands that he did not bring the offspring as a *shelamim* on *Pesach* since it might not have been old enough for a *korban* at the time, for an animal less than eight days old is considered premature.]

Rav Zevid answers in the name of Rava that the offspring was sick on *Shavuos* and could not be brought.

Rav Ashi answers that when the *Gemora* stated that it was brought on the '*Chag*,' it is referring to *Shavuos* and not to *Sukkos*.

The *Gemora* notes that the other *Amora* (Rav Zevid) would say that whenever the *Tanna* uses the term *Pesach*, he would say *Atzeres* (if he was referring to *Shavuos*; since he said '*Chag*,' he must mean *Sukkos*).

The *Gemora* notes the significance of his testimony: It is to exclude the ruling of Rabbi Eliezer who holds that the offspring of a *shelamim* is not offered; consequently he testifies that it is offered. (18b)

### **Todah, its Offspring and its Temurah**

[A *todah* is a type of sacrifice that is brought when someone is saved from a danger.] The offspring of a *todah* offering and its *temurah*, their offspring and the offspring of their offspring, until the end of all time, are all regarded as the *todah*; only they do not require the accompaniment of bread (as is the law by an ordinary *todah*).

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which provides the source for the *Mishna's* ruling (that the offspring of a *todah* is offered on the altar): if he shall offer as a *todah*. From where do we know that if one set aside a *todah* offering and it became lost and he designated another in its place, and the first was then found, and both animals are standing in front of us, he can offer whichever he wishes and bring its bread? It is written: he shall offer as a *todah*. One might think that the second animal (which is regarded as a voluntary *todah*) requires the accompaniment of bread as well; the verse, however, states: he shall offer 'it' as a *todah*. This implies that he brings one animal (with bread), but not two. From where do we include the case of the offspring (of a *todah*), its *temurah* and replacements (that they are offered)? The verse states: if as a *todah*. One might think that all these cases require the accompaniment of bread; the verse therefore states: with the *todah*, implying that the *todah* itself requires bread, but its offspring, its *temurah*, and its replacement do not require the bringing of bread. (18b)

### **Olah, its Temurah and Offspring**

The (male) *temurah* of an *olah*, the (male) offspring of its (female) *temurah*, its offspring and the offspring of its offspring, until the end of time, are regarded as an *olah*: they require skinning, cutting into pieces and to be completely burned.

If one designated a female animal for an *olah* (and the law is that an *olah* is always male) and it gave birth to a male, it is to graze until it develops a blemish. It is then sold and with its proceeds he brings an *olah*. Rabbi Elozar, however, says: The offspring itself is offered as an *olah*.

The *Gemora* asks: Why is it that in the first clause (in the case of the offspring of the *temurah* of an *olah*) there is no disagreement (and all maintain that it is offered on the altar), whereas in the latter clause (where one sets aside a female animal for an *olah* and it gave birth to a male) they do disagree (and where R' Eliezer says that it is offered as an *olah*, the Sages hold that it is left to graze)? [In the first case, where the *temurah* was a female, everyone agrees that its offspring – a male – may be offered as an *olah*. Why then, in the second case, where he designated a female as *olah*, is there a dispute if the offspring of that female *olah* can be offered or not?]

Rabbah bar bar Chanah answers: The first clause has been taught as a disagreement as well, and the opinion mentioned in the *Mishna* reflects that of Rabbi Elozar.



Rava says: You can even say that the first clause is in agreement with the Rabbis, for the Rabbis dispute Rabbi Elozar only in the case of one who designates a female animal for an *olah* (and hold that the offspring cannot be offered), since the mother is not offered (for a female cannot be offered as an *olah*), but in the case of (the offspring of the) *temurah* (of an *olah*), where the mother (the original male *olah*; it is called 'the mother,' for it is the initial source of sanctity here) is offered, even the Rabbis agree (that the offspring may be offered as well). (18b)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### *Offspring of Sacrifice*

Rabbi Yochanan says that the offspring of an obligatory *todah* needs bread, when offered before the *todah*. The *Gemora* (in *Menachos* 80) explains that Rabbi Yochanan holds that this offspring is considered the produce of something sanctified (the *todah*), and one may atone with it.

Tosfos says that the *Gemora* is only discussing a case where the *todah* conceived after it was consecrated, and therefore its offspring is considered produce. However, if one sanctified a pregnant animal as a *todah*, the fetus's status depends on whether we consider a fetus to be a part of its mother, or whether it is considered a separate animal. If we consider it a part of its mother, it has the status of "the offspring of a sacrifice," while if we consider it a separate animal, the consecration is viewed as one who consecrates two animals, with one being the replacement if the other is lost.

### *Breads for Temurah?*

The Rambam (Pesulai hamukdashin 12:8) rules that the *temurah* - exchange of a *todah* requires breads.

The *Gemora* (in *Menachos* 80b) cites the *braisa* of Rabbi Chiya, which says that if one mixed up a *todah* and its *temurah*, and then lost one, there is no solution for the remaining animal, since we do not know whether to bring breads for it.

This *braisa*, and the *Gemora's* discussion of it, assumes that the *temurah* of a *todah* does not require breads, and the Rambam (13) rules like this *braisa*.

The Rashash and Or Sameach note the seeming contradiction in the Rambam's position.

The Even Ha'ezer suggests the following explanation. The reason a *temurah* of a *todah* requires breads is due to the verse, which states that "it and its *temurah*" will be holy. The verse's grouping of the sacrifice and its *temurah* mandates that whatever is done to the original sacrifice must be done to the *temurah*. Therefore, in a standard case of one who makes a *temurah* from a *todah*, just as the *todah* is offered with breads, so is its *temurah*. The *temurah* does not inherently need breads, but only to make it similar to the sacrifice. In Rabbi Chiya's case, one of the animals has been lost and will not be offered. Therefore, if the remaining animal is the *temurah*, the original *todah* will not be offered. Since it will not be offered, there is no more requirement for the *temurah* to be offered with breads, leading to the problem Rabbi Chiya explains.

## DAILY MASHAL

Unlike the other sacrifices that are brought mainly for Hashem, A *shelamim* offering is brought when a person wants to have a feast but also wants to include Hashem. The meat is divided between Hashem, the *Kohanim*, and the owner, and all this meat will be eaten over two days. The *todah* offering is a type of *shelamim*, but it differs in that it must be consumed the day it is brought and before the next morning. Also, there are forty breads that need to be consumed during this short period.

Rav Shimshon Pincus explains the reason for these differences. The *todah* offering is not just any feast, it is a feast of gratitude to Hashem for a salvation you received. It is not enough to be thankful in private, you must very publicly thank Hashem. It is an opportunity to extend the greatness of Hashem to others and it should not be missed. The strict time limit for finishing the meat and the great abundance of bread means that the host will need to invite many people to his party in order to finish it.

So when it comes time to make a party and say Thank You to Hashem, you may be the host, but Hashem makes the menu, and you need to make sure to finish it all up.