



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

Offspring of a Korban

The Gemora asks: But did Rabbi Elozar say that the offspring (of a female which was consecrated as an olah) is itself offered as an olah? The following Mishna is cited in contradiction to that: The (female) temurah of an ashram (which can only be a male), the offspring of a temurah, their offspring and the offspring of their offspring until the end of time, are to be left to graze until they develop a blemish. They are then sold and the proceeds are applied (by the Temple treasury) for voluntary communal offerings. Rabbi Eliezer says: Let them die (for he holds that an ashram has the same law as a chatas in this respect). Rabbi Elozar says: Let him buy (personal) olah offerings with the proceeds. [R’ Elozar agrees with the Tanna Kamma that the animal must be left to graze until it develops a blemish and then it is sold. He disagrees, however, and maintains that the proceeds do not go for communal offerings, rather, the owner himself uses the proceeds for his own personal olah donations.] Now (the Gemora concludes its question by inferring the following with respect of R’ Elozar’s viewpoint), he may only bring an offering with their proceeds, but he may not bring the animal itself (as an olah)!? [This contradicts his opinion stated here that the offspring of a female which was consecrated as an olah is itself offered as an olah.]

Rav Chisda answers: Rabbi Elozar (in the other Mishna) was (not stating his own opinion, but rather) saying to the Rabbis from their own premises, as follows: As far as I am concerned, I maintain that even the offspring itself (of the temurah of an ashram) is also offered as an olah, but

according to your viewpoint that you say that it is not offered, at least admit to me that the surplus (the proceeds from the sale of the offspring) are applied to personal voluntary offerings. The Rabbis, however, replied to him: The surpluses are applied to communal voluntary offerings. [Accordingly, it emerges that according to Rav Chisda, R’ Elozar is consistent with his opinion that the offspring of a female which was designated for an olah, and the offspring of a female temurah of an ashram is offered as an olah. He merely wished that the Rabbis, who hold that it cannot be offered and after it develops a blemish must be sold, the proceeds should go for a personal offering, not a communal one. The Rabbis, however, did not concede to that argument.]

Rava answers: Rabbi Elozar holds that the offspring itself is offered for an olah only in a case where one designates a female animal for an olah, because the mother has the name of an olah (for since we find in connection with birds that an olah can also be a female, therefore although the animal designated for an olah is a female, it retains the name of the olah; furthermore, when it is sold, an olah can be bought with the money, therefore it has the name of an olah), but in the case of temurah of an ashram, where the mother does not possess the name of an olah (for every ashram offering must be a male, and the original offering is offered as an ashram, not an olah), Rabbi Elozar also agrees that although one can buy an olah with its money, the animal itself is not offered.

Abaye asked on Rava from a braisa: But does Rabbi Elozar indeed require that the mother should have the name of an olah? Has it not been taught in a braisa: If one designates a female animal for a pesach sacrifice (which must be a male),

it is sent to graze until it develops a blemish. It is then sold and a *pesach* sacrifice (a male) is bought with its money. If it gave birth (before *Pesach*), it (the offspring) is sent to graze (even if it is a male) until it develops a blemish. [It cannot be offered as the *pesach* sacrifice, for it comes from a mother who was unfit as a *pesach* sacrifice; this is because the mother's disqualification is passed on to its offspring.] It is then sold and a *pesach* sacrifice (a male) is bought with its money. If it (the female animal designated for a *pesach* sacrifice) remained over until after *Pesach*, it is sent to graze until it develops a blemish. [Although a *pesach* sacrifice that remained over until after *Pesach* for some reason, can be brought as a *shelamim*, this animal cannot be offered, for it was defective from the time of its consecration.] It is then sold and a *shelamim* is bought with its money. If it (the female animal designated for a *pesach* sacrifice) gave birth, it is sent to graze until it develops a blemish. It is then sold and a *shelamim* is bought with its money. Rabbi Elozar says: It itself (the offspring) is offered as a *shelamim*.

Abaye concludes his challenge: Now, here is a case where the mother does not have the name of a *shelamim* (for it was designated as a *pesach* sacrifice) and Rabbi Elozar says that it is offered as a *shelamim*!? [According to Rava, R' Elozar holds that the offspring can only be offered as a certain *korban* if its mother has that name!]

Rava said to him: The case after *Pesach* is different, since a surplus *pesach* sacrifice itself is brought as a *shelamim*. [Rava answers that its mother can be called a *shelamim*, for generally, the law is that an animal which was designated as a *pesach* sacrifice and for some reason could not be offered as such, after *Pesach* it is brought as a *shelamim*. This particular animal will not be brought as a *shelamim*, for it was a defective *Pesach* to begin with, but it is still called a *shelamim*, and therefore, the offspring can be offered as a *shelamim*.]

The *Gemora* asks: If this is so (that R' Elozar's reason is because the mother has the name of a *shelamim*), let the

dispute (between R' Elozar and the Rabbis) be stated also in connection with the first clause above? [They should argue as well where the female *pesach* sacrifice gave birth before *Pesach*, and let R' Elozar maintain that the offspring itself is offered as a *shelamim*, since if it was slaughtered for the sake of a *shelamim* it would be valid as a *shelamim*. Consequently, the mother does possess the name of a *shelamim*.]

Rava said to him: Indeed, that is so (that they do argue in that case as well).

Abaye suggests: Rabbi Elozar does not differ in the first clause, for we have learned that the place where a surplus animal goes, its offspring is used in the same way. **[If one designated two animals for security's sake (just in case one was lost), or if the animal which he designated initially was lost and the owner received atonement by means of another animal, and then the first animal was found, the *halachah* with the remaining one, the surplus, varies, and accordingly, the *halachah* of the offspring also varies, depending on the type of offering. Therefore, where one designated a female for an *olah*, just as if one designated an *olah* and the owner received atonement by means of another animal, the second is offered as an *olah*, so too the offspring of a female *olah* is treated in the same way, i.e., as an *olah*. In the case too of a surplus *asham*, which is left to graze, the offspring of the *temurah* of an *asham* is also left to graze.]** Now, after *Pesach*, when a surplus of a *pesach* sacrifice is considered a *shelamim*, its offspring too is used as a *shelamim*, but before *Pesach*, for what purpose did he consecrate the mother? It was for the value of the *pesach* sacrifice (the money obtained through selling the animal is used to purchase a *pesach* sacrifice), therefore in the case of the offspring as well, it is used for the value of the *pesach* sacrifice (but not to be offered as one).

Rav Ukva bar Chama asked on Abaye: But do we say that since the mother is used only for its money value, its offspring is also used only for its money value? Surely it has been taught in a *braisa*: If one designates a female animal for



the *pesach* sacrifice, it and its offspring graze until it develops a blemish, and they are then sold, and a *pesach* sacrifice is bought with the money. Rabbi Elozar, however, says: The (*offspring*) itself is offered as a *pesach* sacrifice. Now here, the mother is consecrated only for its value, and yet Rabbi Elozar says that its offspring is offered as a *pesach* sacrifice, and we do not apply to it the same rule as to its mother!?

Ravina answers: We are dealing here with a case where he designates a pregnant animal, and Rabbi Elozar holds like Rabbi Yochanan, who says that if (*when consecrating a pregnant animal*) he excluded the fetus (*to be consecrated for something else*), the act is valid (*and it is excluded*) for a fetus is not considered as the thigh of its mother (*and therefore, even if he does not exclude it, it does not become consecrated from the strength of its mother, but rather, by its own right, and therefore it can be offered as a pesach sacrifice itself*). Therefore (*when he consecrates a pregnant animal for a pesach sacrifice*) it is only the mother (*being a female*) which does not receive physical consecration, whereas its fetus receives physical consecration (*and since it is a male, it may be offered as a pesach*).

Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina said: Rabbi Elozar admits that where one designates a female animal for an *asham* offering (*which must be a male*), its offspring is not offered as an *asham*.

The *Gemora* asks: But surely this is obvious, for Rabbi Elozar refers only to a case where one designates a female animal for an *olah*, since its mother has the name of an *olah* (*for an olah bird can be a female*), whereas where one designates a female for an *asham*, since the mother does not possess the name of an *asham*, even Rabbi Elozar agrees that it is not offered as an *asham*!?

The *Gemora* answers: If Rabbi Yosi had not informed us of this, I might have thought that the reason of Rabbi Elozar is not because the mother possesses the name of an *olah*, but because the offspring is fit to be offered (*as it is a male*), and

this animal as well (*the male offspring*) is fit to be offered. Rabbi Yosi therefore informs us that it is not so.

The *Gemora* asks: If this is so, why does he inform us that its offspring is not offered as an *asham*? Why not rather inform us that its offspring is not offered as an *olah*, and the same would certainly apply to an *asham*?

The *Gemora* answers: If he had informed us concerning an *olah*, I might have thought that the offspring is not offered as an *olah*, since the mother was not consecrated for that holiness, but as far as offering the offspring as an *asham*, I might have said that it should be offered as an *asham*; Rabbi Yosi therefore informs us that this is not so. (18b – 19b)