



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

[To turn to] the main text: Rav Huna reported in the name of Rav: All the authorities agree that if he selected one [on his own accord] and offered it, the second [chatas] dies. The dispute between them refers only to the case where the owner comes to consult [the Beis din],¹ Rebbe holding that no remedy was devised for dedications,² and that we say: Obtain atonement through the chatas which was never lost and let the chatas which was lost die; whereas the Rabbis hold that a remedy was devised for dedications, and that we say to the owner: Go and obtain atonement through the chatas which was lost, and the chatas which was never lost is condemned to pasture.³

Rav Mesharsheyah raised an objection: But was no remedy devised for dedications? Has it not been taught: Why does the text state: They shall eat? This teaches [us] that if there was only a little quantity [of the meal-offering] the Kohanim may eat chullin and terumah with it in order that it may make a satisfying meal. What is the point of the expression, ‘They shall eat it’? In order to teach us that if the quantity was large, the Kohanim must not eat chullin or terumah with it, in order that the meal-offering should not make an over-sated meal.

¹ As to which chatas he should offer, and thus he did not do anything deliberately to show which animal he intends to offer.

² For we do not care if the second animal dies.

³ And the Mishnah therefore means as follows: One of the chatas korbanos is offered in order that the second shall die, i.e., that the chatas which was never lost should be sacrificed and the lost one be condemned to die. This is the teaching of Rebbe, whereas the Rabbis say that a chatas is not condemned to die in a case where he comes to consult the Beis din, for we say: ‘Go and obtain atonement through the lost chatas’, thus avoiding condemning a dedication to die. Where, however, the owner has already

Is not [this Baraisa] even according to the opinion of Rebbe?⁴ No, it is according to the Rabbis.

But Rabbi Abba reported in the name of Ravb: All the authorities concerned agree that where the owners obtained atonement through the chatas which was never lost, the lost chatas is condemned to die. The dispute between them, however, is where [the owner] obtained atonement through the chatas which was lost, Rebbe holding that the chatas set aside instead of the lost chatas has the law of the lost chatas, whereas the Rabbis hold that it does not have the law of the lost chatas.

We have learned: The second [goat] pastures until unfit for sacrifice. It is then sold and its money is used for a freewill-offering, since a congregational chatas is not condemned to die. Now this implies that a chatas belonging to an individual is condemned to die. And Rav said: Animals [destined for sacrifice] are not removed from sacred use;⁵ and [consequently] when he procures atonement he does so through the second [goat] of the first pair. Now this latter [pair] is like that which is set aside instead of a lost chatas; and yet the reason is because the goat belongs to the

procured atonement, the lost chatas certainly dies, as there is no remedy in consulting, and the same law applies if the chatas is found even before atonement took place, if the owner did not consult the Beis din.

⁴ Since no particular teacher is mentioned. We can therefore infer from here that a remedy was devised for dedications, since the Baraisa says here that chullin must not be eaten with large remainders of meal-offerings for fear of the latter becoming disqualified through being left over.

⁵ And the first animal was not removed from sacred use on account of the death of its companion.

congregation; but if it belonged to an individual it would be condemned to die. Doesn't [this Mishnah] represent even the opinion of the Rabbis?⁶ — No. It represents that of Rebbe.

We have learned: If one set aside a chatas and it was lost and he offered another instead of it, it is condemned to die. Now the reason is because he offered it [and afterwards the first chatas was found], but if he did not offer it [before the first animal was found], it pastures irrespective of whether the atonement then took place through the lost chatas or atonement took place through the chatas which was never lost, and irrespective of whether he selected one [of the chatas offerings] or did not select. Shall we say that this refutes both [Amoraim]? — [The Tanna in the Mishnah] states what he is certain about⁷ but does not state what he is not certain about.⁸

We have learned: If one set aside money for a chatas and it was lost and he set aside other money instead of it, if the first

⁶ Since it is stated anonymously. Hence we can deduce that a chatas set aside has the law of a lost chatas, since atonement is obtained through the first goat, the companion of the one lost. And the one belonging to the second pair, which along with its companion was not lost but was set aside, if belonging to an individual is condemned to die, even according to the opinion of Rebbe. The Rabbis therefore must have a different reason for their view than that given by Rabbi Abba.

⁷ The thing about which he is absolutely certain, and therefore he only mentions the case where atonement took place before the chatas was found and in which the animal is condemned to die, since he is sure of this. You cannot, however, deduce from this case that where the offering had not taken place and the chatas was found, it pastures, since sometimes it pastures and sometimes it is condemned to die, e.g., according to Rav Huna where he selected one chatas, even the lost one, the other is condemned to die, whereas if the owner came to consult the Beis din as to which animal is to be offered, the one remaining over is only condemned to pasture. And according to Rabbi Abba whether he selected one of the animals for sacrifice or came to consult, if atonement was procured with the chatas which was never lost, the lost one is condemned to die, whereas if atonement was procured through the lost chatas, the other is condemned to pasture.

⁸ Where e.g., the chatas was found before atonement took place, when according to Rav Huna, the animal dies if he did not consult the Beis din,

money was then found, he brings a chatas from both [sums], and the rest is used for a freewill-offering. Now the reason is because [the owner] obtains atonement from a chatas brought from both [sums], but if he brought a chatas from one [sum], he takes the other to the Dead Sea, irrespective of whether atonement took place through the lost money, or the money which was never lost, and irrespective of whether he selected one [heap of the money] or he did not select. Shall we say this refutes the two [Amoraim]? — Here too [the Tanna of the Mishnah] states what he is certain about,⁹ but he does not state what he is not certain about.¹⁰

Said Rabbi Ammi: If one sets aside two heaps of money for security's sake,¹¹ he can obtain atonement for one of them and the other is then used for a freewill-offering. Whose opinion does this represent? Will you say the opinion of Rebbe? Surely it is obvious that the second [heap of money] is used for a freewill-offering, since Rebbe [says the money must go to the Dead Sea] only in the case where one sets aside money for what is lost, but he would agree that when

or according to Rabbi Abba, the animal dies if the owner obtained atonement through the animal which was never lost, since where the chatas was found before atonement, it can either pasture or die, according as to whether a certain condition was present, whereas in the former case, viz., where the chatas was found after atonement, the animal is condemned to die without any distinction.

⁹ E.g., where he brings a chatas from both monies. This is a good remedy not requiring any condition. You cannot, however, deduce that where he brings a chatas from one of the heaps of money, the money goes to the Dead Sea, since sometimes it goes to the Dead Sea and sometimes it is used for a freewill-offering, according to the condition set forth respectively in the views of Rav Huna and Rabbi Abba.

¹⁰ E.g., if he brought a chatas from one heap of the coins, the Tanna has to introduce a certain condition, according to the opinion of Rav Huna, viz., whether he selected one heap or not, and according to Rabbi Abba, whether it was the lost money or the other. Since therefore the bringing of a chatas from one heap of money does not determine absolutely that the other goes to the Dead Sea, the Tanna does not trouble to mention it in the Mishnah.

¹¹ So that if one heap was lost, atonement can be procured through the other.

the setting aside is for security's sake [it must be used for a freewill-offering]. Shall I say then that it is the opinion of the Rabbis? But surely it is obvious that the monies are used for freewill-offerings! It is a conclusion from a kal vachomer [as follows]: Seeing that if one sets aside [money instead of the money] for a lost chatas, the Rabbis hold that it has not the law of the lost chatas, can there be a doubt where the setting aside is for security's sake? — Rather he had [to state it] according to the opinion of Rabbi Shimon.¹²

You might have said that Rabbi Shimon does not hold that there can be a freewill-offering [of an animal which was once a chatas]. [Rabbi Ammi] therefore informs us that a freewill-offering [can take the place of a chatas].

But how can you say that Rabbi Shimon holds that there is no freewill-offering in place of a chatas? Have we not learned: There were thirteen horn-shaped [offering] boxes in the Temple and on them were inscribed [respectively] the words, New shekels,¹³ Old shekels,¹⁴ Bird sacrifices,¹⁵ Pigeons for an olah offering,¹⁶ Wood,¹⁷ Frankincense,¹⁸ Gold for kappores.¹⁹ And six [horn-shaped] offering boxes were for the freewill-offerings [of the congregation]. And it has been taught with reference to this [Mishnah]: The statement, 'six boxes for a freewill-offering' means for olah offerings which come from the sacrificial surpluses,²⁰ and the skins do not belong to the Kohanim.²¹ This is the teaching of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Nechemiah — some say Rabbi Shimon — said to him: If so,

the interpretation of Yehoyada the Kohen is nullified, since we have learned: The following exposition was made by Yehoyada the Kohen: [Scripture says]: It is an ashram, he is certainly guilty before the Lord, this includes everything which comes from the surpluses of chatas and ashram offerings, thus enjoining that olah-offerings shall be brought with their money, the flesh to be used for the Name [of God] and the skins for the Kohanim. Consequently we see that Rabbi Shimon holds that there can be a freewill-offering [replacing a chatas]?²² — It is necessary [for Rabbi Ammi to give us his ruling in connection with Rabbi Shimon]. For you might think that Rabbi Shimon holds that there can be a freewill-offering only in one row,²³ but in two rows it is not so, Rabbi Ammi therefore informs us [that it is not so].

¹² Who says that the five chatas offerings are condemned to die and does not hold at all that any of these pasture so that their money could be used for freewill-offerings.

¹³ One who did not bring his shekel payment in Adar could bring it the whole year round and he put it into this offering box.

¹⁴ One who did not bring his shekel during the year brought it the following year and put it into this box. The walls, towers and other requirements of the city were built with this money.

¹⁵ Those who required a ceremony of atonement e.g., a woman after childbirth, a leper, etc. brought money and put it into this box for the bringing of bird sacrifices and could partake of a sacrificial meal in the evening in the confident belief that Kohanim had emptied the box and brought the necessary sacrifices.

¹⁶ He who offered young pigeons for an olah offering put the money for this purpose into this box.

¹⁷ One who offered wood for the altar put the money for it into this box.

¹⁸ The person who gave frankincense put the money for it into this box.

¹⁹ 'Covering'; one who wished to make offerings of gold foil for the sacred vessels put the money for it into this box.

²⁰ Of chatas and ashram me'ilah offerings.

²¹ But they are sold again and olah offerings are bought with the money.

²² Why therefore does Rabbi Ammi need to inform us that Rabbi Shimon holds that a freewill-offering can replace a chatas?

²³ I.e., where one heap of coins was set aside for a chatas and on the lambs becoming cheap there was a surplus from the money.