

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) New grain (cont.)

It is noted that although the Mishnah and Baraisa disagree about the use of new grain for the omer and two loaves both opinions agree that the grain must originate from Eretz Yisroel. This position is at odds with the Tanna of another Baraisa.

A Mishnah in Shekalim indicates that Shemittah produce may be used for the omer.

Rami bar Chama questions the ruling of this Mishnah from the ruling of another Mishnah.

R' Chisda responds to this question and an exchange between them is recorded.

R' Yochanan and R' Elazar disagree over the source of the restriction against using the previous year's barley for the Omer.

Rabbah successfully refutes the source suggested by R' Yochanan.

2) Using disqualified produce for bikkurim

A Mishnah lists certain produce that is disqualified for use for bikkurim.

Ulla rules that if one brought the disqualified produce as bikkurim the produce does not become sanctified.

The Gemara relates that when Rabbah repeated Ulla's teaching R' Acha bar Abba unsuccessfully challenged the ruling from a Baraisa.

R' Ada bar Ahava challenges this response.

Two responses to this challenge are recorded.

It is noted that R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish disagree about Ulla's ruling with R' Yochanan agreeing that the disqualified produce does not become sanctified.

After noting that Reish Lakish explained the rationale behind his position R' Elazar presents an exposition to explain R' Yochanan's position.

The exchange between R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish regarding their respective positions is recorded.

A Baraisa is cited that challenges R' Yochanan's position. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why were the watchmen of the aftergrowths paid from the Beis HaMikdash treasury?

2. What is the point of dispute between R' Yochanan and R' Elazar?

3. What is the status of disqualified fruit that was anyway brought as bikkurim?

4. How did R' Elazar know that he would say a good thing?

Distinctive INSIGHT

No bikkurim before the two loaves of Shavuos

ומנין שתהא קודמת לביכורים?

The Torah states (Shemos 34:22) "The festival of Shavuos shall be for you, the first of the harvest of the wheat." Based upon this, the Gemara determines that the two loaves on Shavuos must be brought before anyone may bring bikkurim.

Chiddushei HaGri"z (earlier, 68b) notes that it seems unnecessary for the verse to specifically teach that bikkurim may not be brought before the two loaves of Shavuos, when we already proved that no minchah is allowed to be brought before the two loaves, which includes bikkurim.

He answers that we might have thought that bikkurim are not part of this general restriction not to be brought before the two loaves because bikkurim are not brought upon the Altar. Bikkurim might have been thought to be different than other offerings or menachos which are included, at least partially, in being burned upon the Altar. For this reason it was necessary to specifically emphasize that bikkurim are, in fact, included in the rule not to be brought before the two loaves are brought.

The Mishnah in Bikkurim (1:3) and Challah (4:10) each cite the rule that bikkurim may not be brought before the two loaves, and the halacha is based upon the verse in Shemos (23:16), "and the Festival of the Harvest, the first fruits of your labors that you sow in the field." This is the very verse which our Gemara identifies as the source for this halacha.

The Rishonim cite the Yerushalmi (Challah 4:5) which notes the halacha from our Gemara (68b) that although a minchah should not be brought from the new grain before the two loaves of Shavuos, if it is brought from this early grain, the minchah is acceptable. The Yerushalmi wonders why the sages refused to accept bikkurim brought early by the people of Har Tzivonim. The Yerushalmi explains that the reason these bikkurim were not accepted was that the sages did not want everyone to be under the impression that it is allowed to bring bikkurim before Shavuos. ר"ש on the Yerushalmi (ibid.) explains the people of Har Tzivonim were prominent, or the situation was well-publicized, and accepting bikkurim from them would have been too well-known, resulting in a widespread misunderstanding that bikkurim

(Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
לע"נ מרת רבקה בת ר' שרגא פאטעל ע"ה
By her children
Mr. and Mrs. David Friedman

HALACHAH Highlight

Using shemittah oil for Chanukah lights

רחמנא אמר לך לדורותיכם ואת אמרת תיבטל

The Torah says "for your generations" and you suggest that it should be nullified?

The Gemara Pesachim (52b) derives from the verse (Vayikra 25:6) "והיתה שבת הארץ לכם לאכלה" – And the Shabbos produce of the land shall be yours to eat," that there is a mitzvah to eat Shemittah produce and one may not destroy it. However, eating is not specific, and, for example, one is permitted to use Shemittah oil in one's lamp since one benefits from the oil while it burns. Ridvaz¹ asserts that it is prohibited to kindle the Chanukah lights with Shemittah oil since one is not permitted to benefit from the oil of Chanukah lights. Sefer Toras Ha'aretz² adds that one may not even use Shemittah oil as fuel for the lamps in shul. Although it is permitted for one to benefit from the lamps that are kindled in shul, nevertheless, their primary purpose is to honor the shul and since that use does not provide benefit for anyone it may not be used for that purpose.

Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach³ suggested that our Gemara provides support for this position that one may not use shemittah produce for the fulfillment of a mitzvah. The Gemara relates that an exposition of the word לדורותיכם

(Insight...continued from page 1)

may be brought before Shavuos.

Gri"z notes that from these Rishonim it seems that the issue of not bringing bikkurim before Shavuos is only due to their being brought before the two loaves, but this is not due to the time in and of itself being inappropriate for bikkurim. Yet, it seems from Rambam that not bringing bikkurim before Shavuos is a function of bikkurim themselves (see Hilchos Bikkurim 2:6). ■

was necessary to teach that the omer is brought during the Shemittah year. The implication is that absent the exposition we would have assumed that it would not be possible to use Shemittah produce for the omer since the kometz is burned on the Altar and the Torah states that Shemittah produce may only be used for eating and not for burning. Although Rav Auerbach goes on to distinguish between the omer and Chanukah lights, he nevertheless, agrees that one may not use Shemittah oil for his Chanukah lights. One reason he gives is that to use Shemittah oil for Chanukah lights is self-contradictory. The allowance to burn Shemittah oil is if one will benefit from the burning oil but on Chanukah one is prohibited to benefit from the lights. Consequently, he agrees that one may not use Shemittah oil for his Chanukah lights. ■

1. פאת השלחן פי"ה הי"ט.

2. ספר תורת הארץ פי"ח אות מ"ז.

3. שו"ת מנחת שלמה ח"א סי' מ"ב. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Brazen Chazzan

"וקסבר חדש בחו"ל דאורייתא היא..."

The Bach, ז"ל, had a big detractor who always worked to undermine him. This person was none other than the chazzan of the community. The two had wrangled before since the chazzan was quite vocal about his belief that studying gemara was unnecessary for arriving at the correct pask. In his opinion, learning Tur, Shulchan Aruch and their commentaries was sufficient for this. The Bach disagreed strongly.

When the Bach came out with his heter to eat the new grain of chutz la'aretz, this chazzan felt certain that he

had erred. Although the Bach points out that gedolei olam had permitted chodosh and even beer made from chodosh, this chazzan began to denigrate the Bach. He would go from group to group, wondering aloud how long they would continue to have, "an ignoramus for a rav."

One Shabbos, the chazzan noticed an error in the sefer Torah from which they were reading and ordered them to take out a new sefer. The Bach disagreed, explaining that it was a minor error and they could continue to read from this sefer. The chazzan cursed the Bach out in public, accusing him of being ignorant of the halachah. It was only when the Bach announced that the man deserved to be put into a form of cherem that cannot easily be revoked that the chazzan finally slunk out.

The chazzan ran to the Rav of Lublin and succeeded in convincing him to give a psak not to call the Bach up to the Torah. The Bach wrote this rav a sharp letter explaining that the chazzan was an ignorant sinner who only knew how to read from the Torah. He demanded that the Rav of Lublin repeal his psak, which he eventually did.

When Rav Nosson Gestetner, ז"ל, told over this story he commented, "We must learn a lesson from this. Despite the Bach's greatness he was confronted with terrible difficulties. Despite such hardships, he strengthened himself. Even with these obstacles, he taught Torah and wrote works that give us vitality to this day!"¹ ■

1. חדש בחדשו, ניסן תשס"ח, ע"ג. ■