

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
in loving memory of **שרגא פייוול דוד בן קמואל**
The Abramowitz family

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Blowing the shofar in front of Beis Din

R' Huna rules that the shofar is blown on Shabbos specifically in front of Beis Din, not only where there is a Beis Din.

Rava unsuccessfully challenges this ruling.

According to a second version R' Huna taught that the shofar of Yovel must be blown during the time Beis Din is in session.

Rava and R' Sheishes unsuccessfully challenge this ruling.

A teaching in support of R' Huna's ruling is cited.

R' Zeira inquires about the parameters of blowing when Beis Din is in session and his inquiry is left unresolved.

2) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara clarifies halachos that could be derived from the precise wording of the Mishnah.

3) MISHNAH: The Mishnah mentions R' Yochanan ben Zakkai's enactment concerning the mitzvah of taking the lulav for seven days, and the prohibition against using new grain until the sixteenth of Nisan passed.

4) Clarifying the Mishnah

The source for creating enactments as a remembrance of the Beis Hamikdash is identified.

The Gemara explains the rationale behind the enactment to prohibit new grain until after the sixteenth of Nisan.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok suggests that R' Yochanan ben Zakkai did not enact a Rabbinic decree against new grain, but rather taught the Biblical law that in the absence of the Beis Hamikdash new grain is prohibited until after the sixteenth.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

- Who blows the shofar on Yom Kippur of the Yovel year?
- What is the source to make enactments as a remembrance of the Beis HaMikdash?
- What happened, according to the Mishnah, when the witnesses did not arrive until after mincha time?
- What does the word **שיבוש** connote?

Distinctive INSIGHT

*When do we institute a **זכר למקדש**?*

ומנלן דעבדינן זכר למקדש וכו' ציון היא דורש אין לה מכלל וכו'

Turei Even explains that the particular aspects of the service in the Beis Hamikdash which were chosen after the destruction to remain as a remembrance, a **זכר למקדש**, are only those which are mentioned in the Torah to have some semblance of observance throughout the land. For example, taking a lulav throughout the land is a mitzvah on the first day of Sukkos. Therefore, with the loss of the Beis Hamikdash, Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai instituted that a lulav should be taken all seven days, and not just the original one day. However, a law which had no application outside the Beis Hamikdash was never to be adopted throughout the land simply to remember what used to happen in the Beis Hamikdash. This is why there is no mitzvah to take an aravah branch for all seven days of Sukkos, because there never was a halacha to take it even for one day anywhere other than in the Beis Hamikdash itself.

Although the rule to establish reminders about the Beis Hamikdash is learned from a verse in Yirmiyahu, this is just an **אסמכתא**, and not a full-fledged lesson.

Chasam Sofer wonders why no elements of **זכר למקדש** were established after the destruction of the first Beis Hamikdash. He suggests that, in fact, the nation should have heeded the lesson taught by Yirmiyahu, and that they should have sought to observe some remembrances. Because the people neglected to do this, this may be why they never merited to have a complete redemption from their exile. There was a certain lack of yearning on their part, and they failed to be answered to a call they never extended. During the period after the second destruction, Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai detected this failure, and he instituted several specific measures to help people remember the service in the Beis Hamikdash, and in this manner, hopefully to earn the merit for us to see a full and speedy redemption from our exile.

According to this explanation, we now can understand the connection between the two enactments of Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai in our Mishnah. He instituted that everyone take a lulav seven days, thus expressing our yearning to remember the service which we sorely miss. Now that we have demonstrated our love for the Beis Hamikdash, we must be careful not to eat **חדש** the entire 16th of Nisan, as we now anticipate an immediate renewal of the service, **במהרה בימינו**. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Fulfilling a mitzvah according to the dictates of Chazal

המה קלקול הלויים בשיר הכא תרגימו שלא אמרו שירה כלה עיקר

What error happened to the Levi'im with regards to the song? Here [in Bava] they explain that they did not recite a song altogether.

The Gemara Megilla¹ records a dispute why there is no recitation of hallel on Purim. According to R' Nachman, the reason is that the reading of the megilla serves the same purpose as hallel. According to Rava, the reason is that the Jewish People did not enter into a period of freedom since they were still subject to the authority of Achashverosh. Meiri² there writes that according to the explanation of R' Nachman if one does not have a megilla he should recite hallel. The only reason not to recite hallel is that it is replaced with megilla reading, but in the event one will not read the megilla, hallel should be recited in its place. Many Poskim disagree with this conclusion. According to some³ the reason is that halacha follows Rava rather than R' Nachman. Still others⁴ explain that the reason is that due to the megilla reading there was never an obligation to read hallel.

Teshuvos Sha'arei Deah⁵ challenges the position of Meiri from our Gemara. According to the sages of Bavel, since the witnesses did not arrive early enough in the afternoon the Levi'im did not know which song to recite so they didn't recite either. Why was this course of action taken? The obligation to recite a song during the offering of a Korban is Biblical and it is only by Rabbinical enactment that they would recite particular

(Overview. Continued from page 1)

5) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah records another post-destruction enactment of R' Yochanan ben Zakkai that relates to accepting witnesses regarding the new moon the entire day rather than only until mincha time.

6) Clarifying the Mishnah

Two opinions are cited to explain the mistake that happened to the song of the Levi'im.

R' Zeira unsuccessfully sought to support his opinion, that the Levi'im sang the wrong song rather than no song at all, from a Baraisa.

Rav Acha bar Huna unsuccessfully challenges the opinion of the sages of Bavel who maintain that the Levi'im did not sing any song. ■

songs. Therefore, if they did not know which song to recite they should have recited something to, at least, fulfill the Biblical commandment to recite a song during the offering of a Korban. This indicates that when Chazal provided instructions as to how to fulfill a mitzvah, even a Biblical mitzvah, and one is unable to fulfill the mitzvah according to their instructions there is no obligation to do anything further to fulfill the mitzvah. Consequently, once Chazal mandate that one should read the megilla in place of hallel the megilla reading is the method to fulfill the mitzvah and if that can not be performed there is nothing else to be done. ■

1. גמ' מגילה יד
2. מאירי שם ד"ה דבר
3. ע' ברכי יוסף או"ח סי' תרצ"ג סק"ד ושו"ת חת"ס או"ח סי' קצ"ב
4. ע' שו"ת תשובה מאהבה ח"א סי' מ"ה ושירי ברכה סי' תרצ"ג סק"א
5. שו"ת שערי דעה ח"א סי' יט"ט ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Two Takanos

משחרב בית המקדש התקין רבן יוחנן בן זכאי שיהי' לולב נטל במדינה שבעה זכר למקדש

During the summer of 5699 (1939), just before the outbreak of World War II, Rav Moshe Betzalel Alter, zt"l, traveled to one of the famous central European spas to enjoy the health benefits of the excellent air and water. The Brisker Rav, zt"l, was also there for the same reason.

One day, the two geonim were taking a walk together, discussing different Torah concepts. The Brisker Rav said, "The Gemara in Rosh HaShanah 30 cites Rabban Yochanan ben Zakai's decree that since the destruction of the Beis Hamikdash, one should take the lulav all seven

days of Sukkos as a reminder of how it was when the Beis Hamikdash still stood. He also prohibited eating chadash until after the sixteenth of Nisan. Tosafos explains that although Rabban Yochanan ben Zakai made many decrees, these were made at the same time, and that is why they are both mentioned here. Tosafos then closes with a question without posing any answer: Why do we find that in Menachos there is mention of the takanah regarding the omer, and not the lulav? Do you have an answer?"

Rav Moshe Betzalel responded, "My brother, the Imrei Emes, shlit"a, explained that the decree to take the lulav the entire seven days of the festival implies that we need the reminder because the exile will be very long. This takanah naturally caused much distress among the

Jewish people. Rabban Yochanan ben Zakai therefore compensated by prohibiting chadash the whole of the sixteenth of Nisan. This extra waiting is meant to ensure that people will not be accustomed to eat chadash from the morning, but must develop the habit of waiting to allow for enough time for the korban omer to have been brought in the Beis Hamikdash. People naturally felt encouraged by this, because it reminded them that they need to be prepared for the Beis Hamikdash to be built at any time."

He concluded, "Now we can understand why we need to see both in Rosh Hashanah and only one in Menachos. We need to see the encouraging takanah when the Gemara brings the distressing one. But when it brings the encouraging one, why raise a distressing subject?" ■