



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### Chagigah Daf Vuv

EIZEHU KATAN KOL SHE'EINO YACHOL LIRKOV...

- **Q:** The Mishna says that the child must be able to travel the distance from Yerushalayim to the Har Habayis. **R' Zeira** asked, what about the travel up to Yerushalayim? If he was able to make it there without his mother, clearly he can make it from Yerushalayim to the Har Habayis!? **A:** **Abaye** said, his mother is chayuv in the mitzvah of Simcha and therefore accompanies him to Yerushalayim. It is only from that point to the Har Habayis that his mother does not go (she is not chayuv in re'iyah), and that is therefore the only distance he must be able to go without his mother.
- **Q: Rabbi** asked on the view of **B"S**, the pasuk says that Chanah did not send Shmuel with his father to the Mishkan. At that point Shmuel was old enough to ride on his father's shoulders, and we see that he did not go!? **A: Rabbi's** father said, you should ask, why is it that Chanah didn't go to fulfil the mitzvah of Simcha? It must be that she felt that Shmuel was a delicate child and would be harmed by the travel. That is the reason she did not go and the reason that he did not go. However, it may be that a regular child would have to go from when he is able to ride on his father's shoulders.
- **Q: R' Shimon** asked, if a minor is lame, or if a minor is blind, is there an obligation to bring him up to the Har Habayis? Now, this question can't be discussing where the child will never be healed, because an adult in that situation would be patur. It must be discussing a case where the child is currently lame or blind, but will be healed before he becomes an adult. **A: Abaye** said, there is only a chiyuv of chinuch where an adult in the same situation would be chayuv. Since an adult who is lame or blind would be patur, there is no chinuch obligation on this child.

B"S OMRIM HARE'YAH SHTEI KESEF...

- A Braisa says, **B"S** say that the re'iyah must be worth a minimum of 2 me'ah and the chagiagh only one me'ah, because the re'iyah is an Olah, which is offered totally for Hashem. Also, we find that on Shavuos more Olos are brought than Shelamim. **B"H** say that the re'iyah must be worth a minimum of one me'ah and the chagiagh must be 2 me'ah, because the chagigah was brought even before Matan Torah and the re'iyah was not. Also, we find that the Ness'im brought more Shelamim than Olos.
  - **B"H** do not hold like **B"S** that the re'iyah is superior based on the fact that it is offered totally for Hashem, because they say that the fact that a chagigah is offered partly for Hashem and partly for the owners makes it superior to the Olah. Also, the comparison to Shavuos is not a good comparison, because the Shavuos korbanos are korbanos tzibbur, whereas the re'iyah is a korbon yachid.
  - **B"S** do not hold like **B"H** that the chagigah is superior based on the fact that it existed before Matan Torah, because they say that the re'iyah was brought before Matan Torah as well. Also, they say that the comparison to the korbanos of the Ness'im is not a good comparison, because they say that those korbanos were a one-time occurrence. A more proper comparison of a korbon brought throughout the generations (the re'iyah and chagigah) would be to another korbon brought throughout the generations (the korbanos of Shavuos).
  - **Q: B"H** seem to say that only the chagigah was brought even before Matan Torah, based on the pasuk that says "Vayizbichu zevachim shelamim". However, the pasuk also says, "Vayalu olos", which suggests that the re'iyah was brought before Matan Torah as

well!? **A: B”H** say that the Olah referred to in the pasuk in the Korbon Tamid. **B”S** however say that the Olah referred to in the pasuk is the Korbon Re’iyah.

- **Abaye** said, **B”S, R’ Elazar,** and **R’ Yishmael** all hold that the Olah brought before Matan Torah was the Korbon Re’iyah, and **B”H, R’ Akiva** and **R’ Yose Haglili** all hold that it was the Korbon Tamid.
  - We have already shown where **B”S** has this view.
  - We see that **R’ Yishmael** has this view from a Braisa. The Braisa says, that **R’ Yishmael** says that the general principles of the mitzvos were said at Sinai, and the details were given later on at the Ohel Moed. **R’ Akiva** says that even the details were given at Sinai, and they were all repeated at the Ohel Moed, and repeated once again in Arvos Moav. Now, if the Olah brought in the Midbar was the Tamid, that would mean that they initially brought the Tamid without the details of the skinning and dismembering, and only later added those details, which would seem to be incorrect. Therefore, it must be that **R’ Yishmael** holds that the Olah brought in the Midbar was the re’iyah.
  - We see that **R’ Elazar** has this view from a Braisa. The Braisa says, that **R’ Elazar** learns from the pasuk of “Olas Tamid ha’asuya b’Har Sinai”, that the instructions were given at Sinai, but the Tamid itself was not offered at that time. **R’ Akiva** says that the Tamid was brought then and continued to be brought from that day on.
  - We have already shown where **B”H** has this view.
  - We have already shown where **R’ Akiva** has this view.
  - We see that **R’ Yose Haglili** has this view from a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R’ Yose Haglili** says that the 3 korbanos of a Yom Tov – the re’iyah, the chagigah, and the simcha – each have a unique characteristic not found by the other two: the re’iyah is offered totally to Hashem, the chagigah was offered before Matan Torah, and the simcha must be brought by women as well.
    - **Q:** We find that **R’ Yose Haglili** says that the Olah brought in the Midbar was the Tamid, which means that he must hold that initially the Tamid was brought without the details of skinning and dismembering and later on those details were added. If so, how can this change in process have been used to prove that **R’ Yishmael** holds like **B”S**, when we see that **R’ Yose Haglili** says that the process actually did change and he therefore holds like **B”H**!? **A:** This proof is therefore refuted and we must remove **R’ Yishmael** from **Abaye’s** list.
  - **Q: R’ Chisda** asked, the pasuk says that Olos were brought and Shelamim were brought, “of parim”. Does that mean that the Olos and Shelamim were of parim or that the Olos were of sheep and only the Shelamim were of parim? **Mar Zutra** says that the practical difference would be to know how to read the pasuk properly with the “trop”. **R’ Acha the son of Rava** says the practical difference would be where one promised to bring an Olah as was brought in the Midbar, does he bring a sheep or a par? **A: TEIKU.**