



4 The Mishnah then said;  
 - אמר לו רבי אליעזר אימורי ציבור יוכיחו  
 R' Eliezer proved from the fact that somebody who brings  
 other קרבנות as אימורי ציבור on שבת is חייב חטאת - that  
 somebody who brings other קרבנות as a פסח on שבת is  
 also חייב, and is not פטור because of מצוה.

4

אמר לו רבי אליעזר  
 אימורי ציבור יוכיחו

proved from...  
 somebody  
 who brings  
 other קרבנות as  
 שבת on אימורי ציבור

that...  
 somebody  
 who brings  
 other קרבנות as  
 שבת on קרבן פסח

חייב חייב  
 טועה בדבר מצוה

5 ר' יהושע responded that the פטור of מצוה does not  
 apply to אימורי ציבור because  
 קרבנות ציבור - יש להן קצבה.  
 We only apply the exemption of מצוה to cases like a  
 קרבן פסח where  
 אין להן קצבה - there are an unlimited number of פסח's.

5

אמר לו ר' יהושע  
 the פטור of  
 טועה בדבר מצוה

Does NOT apply  
 to אימורי ציבור

Does apply  
 to קרבן פסח

because because  
 יש להן קצבה אין להן קצבה  
 there is a set amount there is NO set amount

6 The Gemara asks;  
 - למימרא דכל היכא דאית ליה קצבה מחייב רבי יהושע  
 How can we say that whenever there is a limit, R' Yehoshua  
 would say that he's חייב for violating שבת, because he is not  
 considered a מצוה בדבר מצוה, if יהושע ר' holds that when there  
 are two babies, של ערב שבת, one of which was born Friday,  
 and של שבת, one born on Shabbos - and the person circum-  
 cised the שבת של ערב שבת, he is פטור because he is a  
 מצוה בדבר מצוה - even though there are only these two babies  
 that need מילה!?

6

למימרא  
 דכל היכא דאית ליה קצבה  
 מחייב רבי יהושע

holds ר' יהושע  
 when there are two babies

one born Shabbos ערב שבת & שבת one born Friday  
 and he circumcised  
 the שבת של ערב שבת  
 he is פטור because he is a  
 טועה בדבר מצוה  
 even though there are only  
 these two babies!

7 The Gemara answers that he is considered a מצוה in the case of the babies because the שבת של has not yet been circumcised, and there is still a מצוה to be done.

However, he's not considered a מצוה in the case of the קרבן ציבור, because we are assuming they were already Shechted, and there is no longer any מצוה to be done.

7

<p><i>In the case of the two babies</i></p> <p><b>he is a</b> טועה בדבר מצוה because the שבת של baby has not yet been circumcised. There is still a מצוה to be done</p>	<p><i>In the case of the קרבן ציבור</i></p> <p><b>he's NOT a</b> טועה בדבר מצוה because they were already Shechted. There is no מצוה to be done</p>
---	---

8 ר' מאיר, who considers the person who Shechts another קרבן for the sake of a קרבן ציבור to be a מצוה, would say that even though the קרבן ציבור was already Shechted - however, when שבת began it was ניתנה לידחות - supposed to be overridden for the קרבן at some point - therefore, he's considered a מצוה even after it was already brought. Whereas in the case of the two babies, we are speaking of where there was a double mistake - He already circumcised the שבת של on Friday, and then the שבת של on Shabbos - which means that on Shabbos it was ניתנה לידחות לא.

8

**ר' מאיר**  
who considers Shechting another קרבן  
for the sake of a קרבן ציבור  
to be a מצוה

it was even though the קרבן ציבור was already Shechted

**ניתנה לידחות**

However...

<p><i>In the case of the two babies there was a double mistake</i></p> <p>He already circumcised the שבת של baby on Friday</p>	<p>...and then the שבת של on Shabbos</p> <p>לא ניתנה לידחות</p>
--	---

9 The Mishnah said; ושאר כל הזבחים ששחטן לשום פסח - In a case of Shechting other קרבנות for the sake of פסח - If they were ראוי - appropriate to use as פסח, we apply the concept of טעה בדבר מצוה - if they were not ראוי - not appropriate to use as פסח, we do not apply טעה בדבר מצוה. The Gemara explains that while ר' שמעון makes this distinction, ר' מאיר holds that טעה בדבר מצוה applies equally whether the animal is appropriate or not for פסח,

9

**משנה:**  
ושאר כל הזבחים ששחטן לשום פסח

<p><b>ראוי</b></p> <p>We apply טעה בדבר מצוה</p>	<p><b>If not ראוי</b></p> <p>We do NOT apply טעה בדבר מצוה</p>
--	--

While ר' שמעון makes this distinction  
— ר' מאיר holds —  
applies equally whether appropriate or not

10 as long as it either can easily be confused with the פסח, such as a בהמת חולין, or it has to be brought as a קרבן in its own right, such as a עגל של זבחי שלמים, because טריד בהו - he's preoccupied with Shechting it, which is a Mitzvah.  
However, even מאיר ר' would not apply טועה בדבר מצוה, where it would not be confused with a פסח, and has no requirement of its own to be Shechted, such as a בעל מום, because לא טריד בהו - He's not preoccupied with it at all.

10

*As long as...* It has to be brought as a קרבן in its own right

It can easily be confused

בהמת חולין

עגל של זבחי שלמים

Because טריד בהו

However, does not apply

Where it would not be confused

Has no requirement of its own

בעל מום

Because לא טריד בהו

11 The טועה בדבר מצוה גמרא discusses some other cases of מצוה. ריש לקיש says that if a person eats נותר because he thought it was regular קרבן meat, he is חייב to bring a קרבן and is not considered a טועה בדבר מצוה, because in order to be פטור it has to be טעה בדבר מצוה ועשה מצוה - He erred while trying to do a Mitzvah, AND he ended up doing some Mitzvah.  
However, this is a case of טעה בדבר מצוה ולא עשה מצוה - He did not do any Mitzvah.  
ריש לקיש adds; - אשתו נדה בעל חייב, יבמתו נדה בעל פטור  
If one inadvertently slept with his wife when she was a נדה he is חייב, but if he inadvertently slept with his יבמה while she was a נדה he is פטור.

11

טועה בדבר מצוה

ריש לקיש

If a person eats נותר because he thought it was regular meat

חייב

To be פטור it has to be טעה בדבר מצוה ועשה מצוה

טעה בדבר מצוה ולא עשה מצוה

ריש לקיש adds

יבמתו נדה בלא פטור

אשתו נדה בלא חייב

12 There are two possible explanations of ריש לקיש: First - ריש לקיש agrees with ריש לקיש that where one did not end up doing a מצוה, he is חייב, and therefore, in the case of נותר one is חייב. The case of נדה must be speaking of close to the time of her וסת when there is no מצוה of עונה, and he's likewise חייב because לא עשה מצוה.  
However, in the case of יבמה he is פטור, because even though she was a נדה, he was מקיים the Mitzvah of יבום.

12

2 EXPLANATIONS

1

ריש לקיש agrees with ריש לקיש

לא עשה מצוה

חייב

יבמתו נדה בלא פטור

אשתו נדה בלא חייב

יבום קרוב

Close to her וסת when no מצוה of עונה

13 Second -  
 טעה בדבר מצוה ולא ריש לקיש, and even ר' יוחנן  
 עשה מצוה - no Mitzvah resulted - as in the case of נותר he is  
 פטור.  
 The reason he is חייב in the case of נדה is because he should  
 have asked her about her status, but he cannot ask the meat  
 about its status.  
 Likewise, he is פטור in the case of יבמה, since he could not ask  
 her, because  
 בזיו מינה -  
 He's embarrassed to ask, because they do not yet have an  
 intimate relationship.

13

2

*disagrees with*  
 ר' יוחנן  
 ריש לקיש

even

טעה בדבר מצוה  
 ולא עשה מצוה

אשתו נדה פטור יבמתו נדה

בזיו מינה  
 בזיו מינה

He could not ask her because of embarrassment

He should have asked her about her status

14 - ור' יוחנן כמאן -  
 The גמרא asks what the source in תנאים was for ר' יוחנן to  
 include the case of יבום in the category of מצוה?  
 The גמרא suggests four possible sources and rejects each  
 one:

14

?

ור' יוחנן כמאן

The גמרא suggests 4 sources and rejects each one

15 -1- It cannot be based on ר' יוסי exempting one who carried his  
 מינים on the first day of סוכות that fell on שבת, because there  
 זמנו בהול - the מצוה of מינים has to be done that day, and the  
 person is rushed - Whereas יבום has no time limit

15

1

It cannot be  
 ר' יוסי

Exempting one who carried his מינים on the first day of סוכות that fell on שבת because זמנו בהול

