



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

### Shavuos Daf Yud Aleph

- **Ulla in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if there were Tamid korbanos that were purchased and no longer needed by the tzibbur (they were bought with last year's machtzis hashekel and could no longer be used for this year), they may be redeemed even if they have no mum.
  - **Rabbah** repeated this ruling. **R' Chisda** said, that can't be right, because where has the kedusha of the animal gone!? **Rabbah** said, you surely agree that we don't ask such a question, because a Mishna says – what did they do with the leftover ketores to permit its use in the following year (it must be purchased with the new shekalim)? They would set aside ketores in the value needed to pay workers in the Beis Hamikdash. They would then remove the kedusha of the ketores onto money. Next, they would give the deconsecrated ketores to the workers as their wages. They would then purchase the ketores from them using the new shekalim. Now, there we should also ask “where has the kedusha gone?” This shows that we don't ask that question. **R' Chisda** said, the case of ketores is different, because it is only monetary kedusha, not physical kedusha. **Rabbah** said, if it is only monetary kedusha, why does a Braisa say that it becomes passul if it touches a “tvul yom”? A Mishna says that a Korbon Mincha only becomes passul with its touching of a tvul yom after the flour has been put into a kli shareis, because that is the time that it gets physical kedusha!? Rather, it must be that the ketores has *physical* kedusha! **R' Chisda** would respond, if the ketores has physical kedusha, it should become passul when it is left overnight, as a Mishna says, and yet the Braisa said that it would only become passul by touching a tvul yom, making no mention of becoming passul from staying overnight!? **Rabbah** said, there is no disqualification of being left overnight for ketores, because ketores doesn't spoil. Therefore, even though it has physical kedusha there is no such disqualification.
    - **Q:** After all is said and done, we are left with the question, how can the animals without mum and the ketores be redeemed? Where does the kedusha go? **A:** **Rabbah** said, when these things are made kadosh, Beis Din does so with a stipulation that if they are not needed they should only be invested with monetary kedusha, not physical kedusha.
      - **Q: Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, you yourself have said that if someone is makdish a male ram that is fit for the Mizbe'ach, even if only for its monetary value, it gets physical kedusha and may not be redeemed. If so, what difference does it make that Beis Din stipulated that there should only be monetary kedusha? According to you it will get physical kedusha anyway!? **A: Rabbah's** case of the male ram was talking about where the person was makdish it “for the value to be used for an Olah”. However, if the person was makdish it “for the value to be used for nesachim” it would not automatically get physical kedusha.
      - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that if the par of Yom Kippur is lost and replaced, if the original one is found, **R' Yehuda** says it is left to die and **R' Elazar and R' Shimon** say it is left to get a mum and then sold, because the chatas of the tzibbur is not left to die. Now, according to **Rabbah** we should say that the stipulation of Beis Din should allow these animals to be redeemed, so why must it be left to die or to graze!? **A:** The case of lost animals is different, because it is a very uncommon case, and therefore there is no stipulation made regarding them.

- **Q:** A Braisa says that if a cow was separated for use as a parah adumah and a nicer one was found, the original one may be redeemed from its kedusha. Now, the case of parah adumah is very uncommon, and yet we see that its kedusha must have been made on a stipulation (because if not, how can it simply be redeemed)!? **A:** The case of parah adumah is different, because it only has monetary kedusha, not physical kedusha.
- **Q:** How can you say that the kedusha leaves with a true redemption, not based on a stipulation? A redemption process requires the animal to stand and be assessed, and yet the Braisa says that even if the cow died or was shechted it may still be redeemed!? This must be because a stipulation was made!? **A:** The Braisa of parah adumah follows **R' Shimon**, who says that kodshei bedek habayis (which is the category of parah adumah) do not need to stand and be assessed before being redeemed.
- **Q:** How can we say that the Braisa follows **R' Shimon**, when the Braisa says that if the parah adumah was shechted on its wood on Har Hazeisim it may never be redeemed? We find that **Reish Lakish** said that **R' Shimon** said that a parah adumah *may* be redeemed even if it was shechted there!? **A:** Rather, we must say that the parah adumah was subject to the stipulation that it not become kadosh if it is not needed. Although it is an uncommon case, they made the stipulation by parah adumah, because it is an item of tremendous expense.
- **Q:** The Braisa said that if the parah adumah died, it may be redeemed. What would be the purpose of redeeming it at this point? To give it to dogs to eat? We would not do that!? **A: R' Mesharshiya** said, it would be redeemed so that we can use its hide. The hide of the parah adumah has significant value.
- **Q:** In our Mishna **R' Shimon** said the reason that the different mussafim may be used at other times (e.g. from Yom Tov for Rosh Chodesh, etc.) is because they are all coming to bring a kapara for tumas Mikdash and kodashim. According to **Rabbah** he should not have had to give that reason! He could have simply said that Beis Din's stipulation allows them to be used for any other purpose once they are not needed for the original purpose!? **A: R' Shimon** does not agree that Beis Din makes this stipulation. When **Rabbah** introduced this concept, he was saying it to explain the view of the **Rabanan**. In fact, we find that **R' Idi bar Avin in the name of R' Amram in the name of R' Yochanan** said, in regard to a Korbon Tamid that is no longer needed by the tzibbur, **R' Shimon** says they may not be redeemed if they have no mum, and the **Rabanan** say that they may be redeemed even if they have no mum.
  - **Q:** Who is the view of the **Rabanan** that holds this way? It can't be the **Rabanan** of the Mishna regarding the ketores (quoted earlier), because ketores is different in that it cannot be let to graze! It can't be the **Rabanan** of the Braisa regarding parah adumah, because that redemption may be allowed only because of the tremendous value of a parah adumah! If you will say that it is the **Rabanan** in the Mishna who say that the mussafim may be used for other mussaf purposes even though they hold like **R' Yehuda** who holds that the kapara that they bring are not the same, the reason they allow for this alternate use may be because they hold like **R' Meir**, that all the mussafim bring the same kapparrah, and not because they hold of the stipulation of Beis Din!? **A:** Rather, we must say that **R' Yochanan** had a tradition that **R' Shimon** holds that the extra

Korbon Tamid may not be redeemed and that **Rabanan** hold that it may be.