



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

Six Donation Boxes

The *Gemora* cites the *Mishna* which states that there were six donation boxes in the Bais Hamikdash, for donations.

The *Gemora* asks why there were six, and offers these answers:

1. To avoid strife between the different families of *Kohanim* serving each week, one box was assigned to each day's family. (Chizkiyah)
2. Since there were many coins for donated sacrifices, many boxes were needed, to prevent the coins from rotting. (Rabbi Yochanan)
3. For six types of animals offered as donations:
 - a. Bull
 - b. Calf
 - c. Ram
 - d. Sheep
 - e. Kid
 - f. Goat

This follows Rebbe, who says that one may not fulfill a pledge of a small animal with a larger one. (Ze'iri)

4. For six types of sources of donated sacrifices:
 - a. Extra bulls of communal *chatas* sacrifices
 - b. Extra rams of *asham* – guilt offerings
 - c. Extra sheep of *asham* – guilt offerings
 - d. Extra goats of communal *chatas* sacrifices of the holidays
 - e. Extra money from funds designated for a sacrifice
 - f. The *me'ah* coin, brought to account for variations in *shekel* payments

(Bar Padda)

The *Gemora* explains the reason each one choose his reason, and not the other ones:

1. We aren't concerned that the *Kohanim* will fight over the donations.
2. We aren't concerned that coins will rot.
3. We don't want to make this *Mishna* follow the individual opinion of Rebbe.

The last two sources shouldn't necessitate their own boxes.

- a. There is no need for a box for extra funds, as the first four are already extra.
- b. According to Rabbi Meir, the coins brought with the *shekel* go with the *shekel* coins, and we assume that an anonymous *Mishna* follows Rabbi Meir.

The *Gemora* offers two more reasons for the six boxes:

5. Shmuel says they were for six types of extra funds:
 - a. From a *chatas*
 - b. From an *asham*
 - c. From the *asham* of a nazir
 - d. From the *asham* of *metzora*
 - e. From the *minchah* offered for a *chatas*
 - f. From the *chavitin* loaves of the *Kohen Gadol*

6. Rabbi Oshaya cites the same list, but replaces the leftovers from the *Kohen Gadol's chavitin* with the extra money from a bird offering.

The *Gemora* explains that Shmuel says the extra funds from bird offerings are placed in the box for the bird offerings, listed earlier in the *Mishna*, while Rabbi Oshaya says the extra funds had their own box. Rabbi Oshaya says that the extra funds of the *chavitin* loaves are not offered, but are left to rot.

A Blemished Pledge

The *Gemora* cites a supporting *braisa*, which says that the extra funds of a donated *minchah*, and the extra funds of a *minchah*, are left to rot.

Rav Chisda explains that the *braisa* must be amended to say that the extra funds of a *chatas minchah* are offered as a voluntary *minchah*, while the extra funds of a *Kohen Gadol's* loaves are left to rot.

Rabbah says that the extra funds of a *Kohen Gadol's* loaves may be offered as a voluntary *minchah*, and we can amend the *braisa* to say that the extra funds of a *today's* bread are left to rot.

The *Gemora* says that this is the same as an existing dispute about what to do with the extra funds from a *Kohen Gadol's chavitin*, in which Rabbi Yochanan says they are offered as a voluntary *minchah*, and Rabbi Elozar says they are left to rot.

The *Gemora* attempts to prove Rabbi Yochanan's position from a *braisa*, which lists the types of *minchah*, whose extra funds are offered as a voluntary *minchah*. This list includes the extra funds from "the tenth of an *eifah*," which we assume means the *chavitin*, which were brought from a tenth of an *eifah*.

The *Gemora* deflects this, saying that it refers to the tenth of an *eifah*, offered as a *chatas minchah*.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak says it makes sense to say that the extra from the *chavitin* are left to rot. He cites Rabbi Yehudah, who says in a *braisa* that the verse which reiterates that the sinner's *minchah*, which may have no oil or *levonah* spice, "is a *chatas*" excludes the *Kohen Gadol's chavitin*, which do require *levonah*. Since it is not classified as a *chatas*, it is logical to assume that extra funds from it are different than those from a *chatas*, i.e., left to rot. (107b – 108a)

The *Mishna* says that if one pledged a specific bull as an *olah*, and it got blemished, he may offer two bulls from the money used to redeem it. If he pledged two specific bulls as an *olah*, and they became blemished, he may offer one bull from the money used to redeem them. Rebbe says that he may not. Similarly, if he pledged a specific ram as an *olah*, and it became blemished, he may offer a sheep with the money used to redeem it. If he pledged a specific sheep as an *olah*, and it became blemished, he may offer a ram with the money used to redeem it. Rebbe says he may not. (108a)

Small vs. Large

The *Gemora* asks why he may switch his pledge from one to two animals, as we learned earlier that if one pledged to use a *maneh* to purchase a bull sacrifice, he may not purchase two bulls.

The *Gemora* answers that our *Mishna's* case is different, as he pledged a specific bull, which became blemished. Once it has become blemished, he has no further obligation, and he therefore may purchase two bulls with the redemption money.

The *Gemora* explains that the second case, where one offers one bull from the redemption money of two, is tantamount to offering a smaller animal in place of a larger one. Although he has no further obligation, Rebbe still prohibits one from purchasing one bull in place of the two, just as he does not allow one to offer a smaller animal to redeem a pledge for a larger one.

The *Gemora* says that Rebbe also prohibits the change in the first case, as that would be analogous to offering a larger animal to redeem a pledge for a smaller one, which Rebbe also does not allow. In the *Mishna*, he waited for the Sages to conclude their statement, and then disputed both.



The *Gemora* proves this from the second half of the *Mishna*, where Rebbe explicitly prohibits the case of switching a pledge for a sheep to a ram, which is analogous to offering a larger animal to redeem a pledge for a smaller one. This indicates that Rebbe disputes the Sages on any change between large and small. (108b)

Changing Species

The *Gemora* asks whether the Sages allow one to change from one species of animal to another.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*, in which the Sages say that if one's bull, pledged as an *olah*, became blemished, he may not use the redemption money to purchase a ram, but he may purchase two rams. Rebbe says that one may not, as this would split his one donation into two, as the two *minchah* offerings brought with the two rams cannot be mixed. The *Gemora* explains that this proves that one may switch species, as one may switch from one bull to two rams.

The *Gemora* says that this *braisa* is an alternate version of the Sages, as it prohibits one from switching from a larger animal (bull) to a smaller (ram). It is also a different version of Rebbe, as the only objection Rebbe raises in the *braisa* is the splitting of sacrifices, while Rebbe in the *Mishna* prohibits even the case of switching from a sheep to a ram, where there is only one *minchah*.

The *braisa* continues to state that if one pledged to offer a calf, but offered a bull instead, or pledged to offer a sheep, but offered a ram instead, he fulfilled his pledge. This follows the Sages, who say that one may substitute a larger animal for a pledge of a smaller one. (108b)

Accepting the Obligation

Rav Menashya bar Zevid quotes Rav saying that one may purchase two bulls to replace one blemished bull only if he pledged, "this bull will be an *olah*," but if he pledged, "this

bull is my responsibility as an *olah*," he accepted on himself an obligation to offer one bull.

The *Gemora* challenges this, as perhaps he simply means that he accepted on himself the obligation to offer *this* bull, and that obligation is released once it was blemished.

The *Gemora* amends the statement to say that one may purchase two bulls, whether he pledged, "this bull will be an *olah*," or "this bull is my responsibility as an *olah*." However, if he pledged, "this bull, and its value, are my responsibility as an *olah*," he personally has an obligation to offer one bull, and therefore may not switch to two bulls. (108b)

Which Animal?

The *Mishna* says that if one said that one of his sheep or ox is designated as a sacrifice, and he has two, he must offer the biggest one. If he has three, he must offer the medium one. If he says that he or his late father specified one, but he doesn't know which one, he offers the largest one.

The *Gemora* notes that first case, where he must offer the largest, indicates that one is generous when sanctifying, while the second case, where he must offer the medium, indicates that one is stingy when sanctifying. Shmuel explains that one is generous when sanctifying, and in the second case, the *Mishna* means that one must consider the possibility of the medium one being the sanctified one, as it is generous relative to the smallest. Rabbi Chiya bar Rav explains that he must wait until the medium one gets a blemish, and he then redeems it on the larger one, which is then offered. (108b)

An Ox vs. One Ox

Rav Nachman quotes Rabbah bar Avuha saying that the medium one is a possibility only when he said *one* of my oxen, but if he said *an ox* of my oxen, he meant the best one.

The *Gemora* challenges this from Rav Huna, who says that if one told someone that he is selling him a house within his house, he may give him the *aliyah* – upper level, which is the lowest quality, implying that this phrase means the lowest, not highest, quality.

The *Gemora* deflects this, saying that Rav Huna is referring to *me'ulah* – the best part of the house, which is consistent with Rav Nachman's statement.

The *Gemora* challenges Rav Nachman from a *braisa*, which says that if one sanctified an ox from his oxen, or if a sanctified ox got mixed in with other oxen, he must offer the best. The *braisa* says that they must be all sold for use as *olah* sacrifices, and the money can be used for mundane purposes. The *braisa's* requirement that all be sold indicates that he may have meant other oxen besides the best, even though he said *an ox*.

The *Gemora* deflects this, saying that the end of the *braisa*, which requires all the oxen to be sold, is only referring to the case of a sanctified ox which got mixed in with other oxen. When the *braisa* cites the case of *an ox* as a similar case, the only similarity is that the best one is offered as a sacrifice.

The *Gemora* challenges Rav Nachman from a *braisa*, which says that if one sold someone *a house* among his houses, he can claim it was any house, even one that collapsed. Similarly, if he sold someone *a slave* among his slaves, he can claim it was any one, even one that died. If Rav Nachman is correct, we should assume he meant the best, and check if that was the one that collapsed or died.

The *Gemora* deflects, saying that in a sale, the buyer has the lower hand, since he is claiming property owned by the seller.

The *Gemora* concludes that once we make this distinction, we can say that Rav Huna did mean that the seller can claim

he sold him the attic, as a sale is different than sanctification. (108b – 109a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

More or less?

The *Mishna* discusses what one may purchase with the money of a pledged animal which became blemished. The cases listed are:

Pledged	Replacement	Ruling
One bull	Two bulls	Y
Two bulls	One bull	Y, Rebbe: N
Ram	Sheep	Y
Sheep	Ram	Y, Rebbe: N

The *Gemora* challenges the ruling in the first case from the earlier *Mishna*, which said that if one pledged to offer a bull from one *maneh*, he may not purchase two bull sacrifices from that *maneh*.

Rashi states that even the Sages, who permit one to change from a small to large animal, agree with the earlier *Mishna*.

The Rashash notes that Rashi is assuming that changing from one bull to two bulls is equivalent to changing from a large animal to a small one, and the Sages therefore agree.

The *Gemora* proceeds to discuss the second case, and explains that Rebbe says that one may not switch to two bulls, as that would be like switching from a large animal to a small one.

Rashi explains that a sacrifice of two animals, even if each is of lesser value, is considered a larger sacrifice than one animal.

The Rashash notes that this assumption of the *Gemora* is inconsistent with the explanation Rashi offered earlier.

The Rashash explains that the *Gemora's* assumption at this point is only an initial one, since we first assumed that Rebbe only disputes the second case. If Rebbe only disputes the second case, it must be because it is the worse case of changing from a large to small animal. However, once the *Gemora* concludes that Rebbe disputes all four cases, we can return to the (correct) assumption that one larger animal is considered larger than two smaller animals.

The Rashash explains that this is why Rashi in the *Mishna* explains that in the first case one may replace the one bull with two, "even though it is a case of switching from large to small." Although this is inconsistent with Rashi's explanation of Rebbe's position in the *Gemora*, that explanation was only based on the *Gemora's* initial logic.

He therefore disputes the Tzon Kadashim, who amends this line in Rashi's explanation of the *Mishna*.

He also challenges the Tosfos Yom Tov, who quotes Rashi's explanation of the *Gemora's* assumption about Rebbe, since this was only an initial assumption, which was not retained.

See Rashash for discussion of how these calculations may fit in with the *Gemora's* following discussion of switching from one species of animal to another.

DAILY MASHAL

A Minchah: Like a Body Without a Soul

At the start of Menachos we cited the following *peninah*: The pupils of HaGaon Rav Chayim of Volozhin zt"l write in the name of their mentor: Prayer resembles the *tamid*. "Prayer without concentration is like a body without a soul." This means that prayer without concentration does not have the advantage of an animal sacrifice, which has a soul, but the advantage of a *minchah*, which is "a body without a soul" (*Tosefes Ma'aseh Rav*, 12; *Keser Rosh*, 22; *Beiurei Rabeinu Chayim MiVolozhin*, 163).

A reader sent us an interesting addition which he heard from HaGaon HaTzadik Rav Gedalyah Eiseman, *mashgiach* of Kol Torah Yeshivah. Chazal's statement, that prayer without concentration is like a body without a soul, denegrates the value of such prayer while Rav Chayim's statement apparently enlivens it as he treats such prayer as a *minchah*! However, a *minchah* was offered by a poor person who could not afford to offer an animal. From such a person, who is not able to pray with concentration, his prayer is accepted like a *minchah*. But someone who could have prayed with concentration should not expect his prayer to be regarded...