

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

The Gemara continues to clarify the offerings the Mishnah referred to when it mentioned bulls, rams and lambs.

2) Sefer Yechezkel

A Baraisa explains a verse in Yechezkel to mean that if the number of animals required for an offering are not available one should offer whatever number are available.

Another verse in Yechezkel is cited and a difficulty in that verse is raised.

R' Yochanan and R' Ashi offer different explanations for this verse.

A Baraisa is cited that supports both of these responses.

Another verse in Yechezkel is cited and a difficulty in that verse is raised.

R' Yochanan and Ravina offer different explanations for this verse.

Another difficult verse from Yechezkel is cited and explained.

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav reports that Chanina ben Chizkiyah prevented Sefer Yechezkel from being concealed since there are verses in it that seem to contradict the Torah.

3) R' Shimon's position

A Baraisa is cited that explains R' Shimon's position that if one has limited funds it is better to purchase a bull and its nesachim rather than multiple bulls without their nesachim.

4) MISHNAH: A Mishnah discusses and presents different opinions about the relationship between the two loaves brought on Shavuot and the olah, chattas and shelamim that are brought with the two loaves.

5) The two loaves and the accompanying offerings

Another Baraisa elaborates on the relationship between the two loaves and the accompanying offerings.

The logic contained in the Baraisa is unsuccessfully challenged.

6) The dispute between R' Akiva and Ben Nanas

R' Akiva and Ben Nanas present their sources for their respective positions.

The exchange between them regarding their expositions is recorded.

An alternative explanation of this dispute is presented. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
L'Ilui Rav Pinchas ben Zalman
by the Singer family

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
In memory of R' Noson Eliyahu ben HaRav Avraham Yitzchak
by the Abraham family, Lakewood NJ

Distinctive INSIGHT

Were the offerings from grain brought in the desert?

שכן מצינו כשהיו ישראל במדבר ארבעים שנה קרבו כבשים בלא חנם

The Gemara states that during the entire forty years the Jews were in the desert they offered the sheep without the loaves. This refers to the offering of Shavuot, where two wheat loaves are supposed to be brought together with two sheep. We can study the laws of whether other offerings which were from grain were brought, such as the lechem hapanim which were placed upon the Shulchan every week, and the offering of the omer, which was to be brought on the second day of Pesach from the first barley.

Tosafos (ד"ה קרבן) cites the Gemara from 95a that says that the Jewish people brought the lechem hapanim while in the desert, as we find in reference to the dedication of the Mishkan (Shemos 40:24), "and he arranged the lechem [upon the Shulchan] before God, just as God had commanded Moshe."

Tosafos (ibid.), Rashi, and Rambam (Commentary to Mishnah), et al., explain that the two loaves for Shavuot were not brought in the desert because the Jews only had manna there. They did not have grain, and the two loaves were not allowed to be made from manna. Rashi also notes that the two loaves had to be from wheat of the Land, which they certainly did not have. Rabeinu Tam contends that the verse (Vayikra 23:10) which introduces the mitzvah of the two loaves states, "When you come to the land..." This teaches that the mitzvah of bringing the two loaves did not even apply until the nation crossed into Eretz Yisroel. Tosafos also points out that these two loaves are referred to (ibid. v. 17) as "bikkurim," and bikkurim are only brought from the pro-

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why does the verse in Yechezkel refer to the bull offered on Rosh Chodesh as a chattas when it is an olah?
2. Why was there a movement to conceal Sefer Yechezkel?
3. What is the point of dispute between R' Akiva and Ben Nanas?
4. Is it necessary for words to be the same to have a gezeirah shavah?

HALACHAH Highlight

Reading the wrong korban paragraph on Chol HaMoed Sukkos

אלא פרים דאפילו אהדדי לא מעכב

Rather the bulls are not essential even to each other.

The Gemara concludes that when there is an obligation to offer multiple bulls as part of a Mussaf offering the bulls are not essential to one another. This principle is codified in Rambam as well. He writes¹ that the Mussafin are not essential to one another, regardless of whether it is the Rosh Chodesh, Yom Tov or Shabbos Mussaf. In the event that one of the required animals is not available, the ones that are available should be offered.

Teshuvos Shevet Halevi² was asked to issue a ruling regarding what should be done if a person on Chol HaMoed Sukkos read the korbanos of the day before. He noted that Teshuvos Shoel U'meshiv rules that one must repeat Mussaf if he reads the paragraph of korbanos of the previous day whereas Chaye Adam and Mishnah Berurah³ disagree and maintain that one is not obligated to repeat Mussaf in such a circumstance. Shevet Halevi then notes that בדיעבד this is not considered as though he mentioned another korban since Rambam writes that different Mussafin are not essential to one another nor is the number of animals that one is required to offer. Consequently, if on the third day of Chol Hamoed one reads about the korban for the fourth or second day b'dieved he has fulfilled his obligation.

Teshuvos Minchas Yitzchok⁴ raises the following question regarding this ruling. Chaye Adam writes that although the number of animals is not essential as mentioned in the Gemara and Rambam, nevertheless, that ruling is limited to a circum-

duce of Eretz Yisroel.

As we noted, there are those who say that the two loaves must be brought from grain, and the manna is not considered to be "bread" because it is not made from one of the five grains. Ritva comments (Kiddushin 38a) that one may not fulfill his obligation to eat matzah on Pesach if he eats matzah of manna, because matzah can only be brought from a commodity which can ferment and become chametz. Noda B'Yehuda also rules that there was no obligation to separate challa from one's portion of manna, because it did not have the legal status of being bread. Nevertheless, we do find (Berachos 38b) that the Jews in the desert did recite the blessing after a meal after they ate manna. Regarding the beracha they might have recited before eating from manna, Nishmas Adam writes that they did not say "hamotzie lechem min ha'aretz," because the manna did not grow from the ground. Teshuvos Torah L'Shema cites Rem"a miPano who says that the beracha they said before partaking of the manna was "hamamtir lechem min hashomayim," based upon the verse (Shemos 16:4) which describes that the manna was bread which descended from the heavens. ■

stance in which the needed animal was not available. It is clear, though, that if later in the day that animal became available it would be necessary to offer that animal. Similarly, if a person read about the korban of a different day he should have to correct that error as long as it is still that day. ■

1. רמב"ם פ"ח מהל' תמידין ומוספין ה"כ.
2. שו"ת שבט הלוי ח"ד סי' ס"ג וע"ע ח"י סי' י"ז.
3. מ"ב ס"ס תפ"ח.
4. שו"ת מנחת יצחק ח"ח סי' מ"ט. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Ascending upon high

"הלחם מעכב את הכבשים ואין הכבשים מעכבין את הלחם..."

The Shem MiShmuel, zt"l, teaches a very practical lesson from a statement on today's daf. "In Menachos 45 we find that in Rabbi Akiva's opinion the bread of the shetei halaechm is me'akev the two lambs brought as a korban tzibur along with the shtei halechem but not the reverse.

"The Midrash teaches that lechem alludes to Torah as we find in the verse, 'לכו לחמו בלחמי'.

specifically to the shtei halechem, explaining that the two breads allude to the shnei luchos habris.² It is the blood of the two lambs which permits the lambs when it is poured on the mizbeach. The blood is the nefesh of the korban and alludes to learning Torah with vitality. The lechem of Torah is me'akev, but although the blood which alludes to enthusiasm is important it is not m'akev. This teaches that the main thing is to learn even when one cannot muster enthusiasm.

"Although the halacha follows Rabbi Akiva, Rabbi Shimon in our Mishnah says the opposite. According to him the main thing is the lambs which allude to the kavanah. As always, Rabbi Shimon—who is Rav Shimon bar Yochai— ascribes

the greatest importance to the feelings imbued within holy actions. The Zohar is filled with similar teachings, writing explicitly that Torah and tefilah do not ascend without feeling, since the feeling is likened to wings which enable holy words and actions to soar on high.

"Nevertheless, even according to Rabbi Shimon one should learn Torah and do mitzvos even if he cannot muster up kavanah. If one is sincerely wishes to become lishmah he merits this level and even the Torah he learned without proper feeling is purified and redeemed."³ ■

1. בראשית רבה, פי ע'
2. זוה"ק, ח"ג, דף צ"ח
3. שם משמואל, שבועות תר"ע, ע' מ"ד