

‘They’; and not their offspring

הם ולא ולדותיהם –

OVERVIEW

אסור, and (still) קמה is which was changed into חטים of אתנן maintain that an ב"ש concerning the פסוק of הם (שני) which ב"ה utilize to exclude קמה from the חטים ועשאן (that they אתנן of the ולדות to exclude it comes to be brought as a קרבן), but not to exclude קמה חטים ועשאן (which are אסור to be brought as a קרבן), but not to exclude קמה חטים ועשאן (which are אסור to be brought as a קרבן). Our תוספות will analyze the view of ב"ש who prefer that the דרשה of הם should exclude ולדות (from the אסור of אתנן) rather than to exclude חטים חטים ועשאן.

משמע הכא דטפי מסתבר לאסור חטין ועשאן סולת יותר מולדותיהם¹ -

It appears from the גמרא here that there is more reason to prohibit חטין ועשאן than to prohibit the ולדות to be brought as a קרבן, סולת

asks:

ותימה דבפרק כל הצלמים (עבודה זרה דף מז.א ושם דיבור המתחיל הכא) **משמע איפכא -**

And this is astounding! For in פרק כל הצלמים it seems that the opposite is true; - גמרא there is more reason to prohibit ולדות חטין ועשאן קמה. This is evident there in the -
גבי יש שינוי לנעבד או לא² -

Concerning the issue whether the rule of ‘change’ applies to something that was worshipped (for ע"ז) or not.

דבעי למימר דמשתחוה לחטין קמחן מותר למנחות -

Where the גמרא wanted to say that if one bows down to wheat, then that flour (made from the worshipped wheat) may be permitted to be brought for מנחות; it is possible to maintain this -

ואף על גב דאמרין בעיברו ולבסוף נרבעו דברי הכל אסורים -

And even though we maintain in a case where a cow became pregnant and subsequently bestiality was committed with the mother (and the fetus), all agree that the mother and the born fetus are forbidden to be brought as a קרבן, and the גמרא explains the difference between the flour and the fetus -

דהתם מעיקרא בהמה והשתא בהמה ובבא³ הוא דאחידה באפה -

¹ There is a מיעוט of הם to exclude something from the אסור of אתנן. It can exclude (either) חטין ועשאן קמה or the ולדות (or even both according to ב"ה). ב"ש chose that the מיעוט exclude the ולדות and not קמה חטין ועשאן; indicating that by חטין ועשאן קמה there is more reason to prohibit them than the ולדות.

² The issue there is, whether something that was worshipped for ע"ז, can it be permitted to be brought as a קרבן if it experienced שינוי or not.

³ Our texts there read דשא. The meaning is similar that a door; a gate is not permitting to fetus to leave the womb, but it is already a cow.

For there by the animal, the fetus was initially a cow (when the רביעה took place) **and now** (when we want to bring it as a קרבן) **it is also a cow, and** it was merely **the gates of the womb which were closed in her face** and did not allow the fetus unto the outside world. However nothing intrinsically changed from the fetus status to the newborn status. However -

הכא מעיקרא חטין והשתא קמה –

Here by the flour, initially it was wheat and now it is flour. This may be a sufficient change to allow it to be brought for מנחות. It is evident from that גמרא that there is more reason to permit flour than to permit ולדות; why is it that here the גמרא assumes the exact opposite that that ולדות are more permissible than flour?!⁴

anticipates a possible answer:

ואין לומר דהא דשרינן ולד אתנן היינו בנותן לה ואחר כך עיברה⁵ –

And one cannot answer that when גמרא here maintains **that ב"ש permits a** **ולד אתנן** **that is only in a case where he gave her a (non-pregnant) cow and she became pregnant later,** that is why the ולד is לקרבן, however if the cow would be pregnant at the time it was given as an אתנן, then ב"ש would admit that it is אסור, as the גמרא states in ע"ז. This would (seemingly) resolve the contradiction).

however, rejects this solution:

דהא משמע⁶ בפרק כל האסורין (תמורה דף ל, ב ושם דיבור המתחיל דניחא) –

For it seems in **פרק כל האסורין**, that -

דדומיא דולד הנרבעת שרינן ולד אתנן –

we permit a ולד אתנן **for a קרבן in a situation similar** to the one where we prohibit the **ולד הנרבעת** (which was mentioned previously) **for a קרבן**. The ולד הנרבעת is prohibited if the mother was pregnant during the act of רביעה; the same permission will be by אתנן. The original question remains. Here we maintain that קמה is more אסור than ולד and there we maintain that ולד is more אסור than קמה.

answers:

ויש לומר דהתם ודאי יש להתיר יותר חטין שנשתנה שנעשה סולת⁷ מולד נרבעת –

⁴ See 'Thinking it over' # 1.

⁵ Even if we maintain that the fetus of a pregnant cow is more אסור than קמה, nevertheless a fetus that was not present at all during the אתנן is certainly more permissible than flour.

⁶ The גמרא there does not say so explicitly. However the גמרא first cites the היתר of ולד אתנן. Then the גמרא continues that ולד נרבע (ונגחן) if ולד נרבע (ונגחן), עיברה ולבסוף נערב (ונגחה), indicating that by אתנן it is מותר. See אמ"ה.

⁷ When someone bowed down to the wheat he worshipped wheat not flour. However, when the act of רביעה took place it was with the entire animal including the fetus (we cannot say that only one part of the animal was נרבע; it was the entire animal).

And one can say; that there it is certain that חטין which changed and became flour should be permitted more than the וולד הנרבעת -

דהיא וולדה נרבעו ובבא בעלמא דאחידה באפה –

For the mother and the וולד were נרבעו and it is only that the gates were shut in her face -

אבל גבי אתנן עיקר דעתה משום קמח וגבי בהמה עיקר דעתה אפרה⁸ ולא אולד:

However concerning אתנן when she received the wheat her main intention was to use it for flour and when she received a cow her mind was for the cow and not for the וולד.

SUMMARY

There is more reason to prohibit the וולד of a נרבע to be brought as a קרבן (since she was also involved in the רביעה), than to prohibit flour that was made from wheat which was worshipped (since he worshipped wheat and not [ground up] flour).

There is more reason to prohibit the flour which was made from אתנן wheat (since her mind was always on the flour), than to prohibit a וולד אתנן (since she cares primarily about the cow [not the וולד]).

THINKING IT OVER

1. גמרא points out a contradiction between our גמרא (where סולת is more אסור than וולד) and the גמרא in ע"ז (where וולד is more אסור than סולת).⁹ However, our גמרא is according to ב"ש, the גמרא in ע"ז would be following the view of ב"ה, so there is seemingly no contradiction?!¹⁰

2. ב"ש maintain that the סולת is אסור since her mind is on the סולת (according to answer). How do we know that ב"ש maintains שינוי אינו קונה, perhaps שינוי is קונה; however here it is different since it is not a שינוי for her, since she always wanted the סולת and not the חטים?¹¹

⁸ Concerning אתנן (where nothing wrong was done with the animal) the issue is the intention of the חטין; by חטין she has use only for the קמח not חטין and by a cow her immediate interest is in the cow, not the fetus.

⁹ See footnote # 4.

¹⁰ See אמ"ה.

¹¹ See גמ"מ.