

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **MISHNAH (cont.):** The Mishnah describes the process of skinning and dismembering the Tamid. Included in this description is the manner in which the insides of the Tamid were rinsed. After an elaborate description of how they would dismember the lamb, the Mishnah enumerates what each of the kohanim involved in transporting the Tamid to the Altar would hold and the manner the limbs were held. The Mishnah concludes with teaching where the kohanim placed these limbs upon the ramp of the Altar.

### 2) Clarifying the Mishnah

A Beraisa is cited that further clarifies how the lamb was tied for slaughter.

Two reasons, one from R' Huna and the second by R' Chisda, why the Tamid was not tied up the way lambs would normally be tied up are presented.

The difference between these two positions is explained.

### 3) The tables of the Courtyard

The Mishnah in Shekalim is cited that discusses the tables that were used in the Beis HaMikdash.

The reason these tables were made of marble rather than gold or silver is explained.

### 4) The location of the slaughter of the Tamid

R' Chisda cites the source for the Mishnah's rulings related to where the morning and afternoon Tamid are slaughtered.

A Beraisa is cited in support of this teaching. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Where was the stomach of the Tamid rinsed ?  
.....
2. Which was larger, the left flank or the right flank ?  
.....
3. How many kohanim carried the limbs of the Tamid to the Altar ?  
.....
4. What determined the location where the morning and afternoon T'midim were slaughtered ?  
.....

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Mr. Richard Tresley  
In loving memory of his mother

מרת דאבא בת ר' אברהם זאב, ע"ה

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *The binding of the tamid and for Akeidas Yitzchok*

תנא יד ורגל כעקידת יצחק בן אברהם

The Mishnah taught that the sheep used for the tamid offering was not "tied up" while it was shechted, but it was rather "bound up." The Beraisa explains that this means that each foreleg of the animal was tied to the hind leg behind it. The Beraisa adds that this was how Avraham tied Yitzchok when he prepared him to be brought at the moment of Akeidas Yitzchok.

Ra'aved explains that tying a sheep with its two front legs together and then its two hind legs together—which is the way sheep are normally tied—would allow the animal mobility to jerk excessively when being slaughtered. When Avraham tied Yitzchok, he also avoided tying him in this manner, for the reasons given in our Gemara.

Rav Huna and Rav Chisda each gave an explanation why the normal manner of tying a sheep was not allowed for a sanctified animal. One Amora says that when an animal was brought to market to be sold as meat, it was generally tied with its forearms and its hind legs all together. Binding an animal for an offering in the same manner would be disgraceful for the offering, as it would give the appearance of it being a regular animal taken from the market. The other Amora says that when performing their sacrifices for idolatry, non-Jews tied their animals with the forearms together and the legs together. We therefore avoid using this procedure. Ra'aved says that these reasons are why Avraham did not tie Yitzchok with his hands and feet together.

Maharsha asks how did the Gemara know that Avraham did not tie Yitzchok's hands and feet all together? He quotes Rashi on Chumash (Bereshis 22:9) who says that Avraham did tie Yitzchok's arms and legs together, and that this is the definition of "binding/akeida". Maharsha suggests that our Gemara which says that the tying at the Akeida and that done for the tamid was similar only means to say that both were tied, but the procedure used in each case was distinct. The tamid was secured with the hand-to-foot method, but Yitzchok was tied with his hands and feet all together.

Rambam (Hilchos T'midin u'Musafin 1:10) writes that the tamid was not tied at all, in order that our procedures not imitate those used by the gentiles, but it was rather held down when it was shechted. Lechem Mishnah adds that according to Rambam it is quite possible that Akeidas Yitzchok was also done without tying, and that his hands and legs were just held together. Other commentators write that Yitzchok was definitely tied in some manner, but perhaps it was with cord of silk. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Abramchik  
לעילוי נשמת

הרב מיכאל בן הרב אלחנן שרגא זצ"ל

# HALACHA Highlight

## Emulating the ways of the gentiles

משום דמהלך בחוקי העמים

*Because it follows the practice of the nations*

The Torah prohibits one from walking in the ways of the nations (Vayikra 20:23). Sefer Yeraim<sup>1</sup> explains that included in the prohibition are not only idolatrous practices; even activities that gentiles do in accordance with their laws and customs are prohibited. He also mentions that the Tosefta enumerates all the gentile practices that are prohibited and explains that one cannot question the list since it was not compiled based on logic; rather it was received by tradition. He also contends that the prohibition does not apply to practices of gentiles in general; it is limited to the practices of the seven nations indigenous to Eretz Yisroel.

Sefer Bris Moshe<sup>2</sup> first notes that Sefer Yeraim's position that the prohibition against behaving like a gentile is limited to the seven nations indigenous to Eretz Yisroel is not found in any of the Rishonim or the writings of those who count and explain the mitzvos. Furthermore, our Gemara seems to refute his position. The Mishnah states that the four legs of the lamb were not bound together for

slaughter; instead, the foreleg and back leg on the right side were bound together and the foreleg and back leg on the left side were bound together. R' Huna and R' Chisda disagree about the reason why all four legs of the lamb were not bound together. One opinion maintains that it is a disgrace to the korban and the other opinion maintains that it is an idolatrous practice to bind the lamb together in that manner. The Mefarsh<sup>4</sup> explains that when gentiles slaughtered sacrifices to their idol they would bind together all four legs. The generic language of the Mefarsh indicates that this was a known gentile idolatrous practice which was not unique to the seven indigenous nations of Eretz Yisroel. He therefore suggests that even Sefer Yeraim will agree that the prohibition against emulating the ways of the gentiles applies to all gentiles, it is just that the primary force behind the prohibition is emulating the ways of the gentiles indigenous to Eretz Yisroel. ■

<sup>1</sup> ספר יראים דפו"ת סי' שיי"ג, דפו"י פ"ח.

<sup>2</sup> ברית משה על הסמ"ג לאוין נ אות ב'.

<sup>3</sup> מפרש ד"ה וחד אמר מפני שהוא מהלך בחוקי העמים. ■

# STORIES off the Daf

## Household Offerings

"ומלחם..."

It is an ancient custom to place salt on the table an every meal where one breaks bread. The Rema in Shulchan Aruch mentions this custom—which is from the Shibolei HaLeket, ז"ל—and explains that it stems from a halachah brought on today's daf. "It is a mitzvah to place salt on one's table before one breaks bread since the table is like the Altar and one's food is compared to a sacrifice. Just as the sacrifices were salted, so too do we salt our bread. Tosafos and the Hagahos HoAshri write that this practice protects from punish-

ment."<sup>1</sup>

But in pre-modern times salt used to be very costly and was not always readily available. Before there were refrigerators, preserving meat and the like was often a necessity, which we have the luxury of doing today with refrigeration.

One man who found it impossible to procure salt wondered if anything else was acceptable. When he asked the Ben Ish Chai, ז"ל, he was told that it was not a simple matter. "The Halachos Ketanos, ז"ל, postulates that one may also salt sacrifices with sugar. He points out that although salt is the opposite of sugar, this proves nothing since we often find opposites that have the same properties. Since the main reason why we salt is to preserve—this is obvious from a flour offering, for flour

is only affected by salt in this manner—and sugar also preserves, it should be acceptable. But the Arizal reveals awesome secrets regarding why we use salt specifically. For example, לחם and מלח have the same letters and salting alludes to mitigating heavenly judgments. In this way, salt 'fights the battle' in the bread. Who is to say that sugar is also effective in this way? And besides the Kabbalistic question, who is to say that the Halachos Ketana's chiddush is correct? Therefore, you should try to procure some kind of salt. If none is available, use sugar, since perhaps the Halachos Ketanos is correct and it does help."<sup>2</sup> ■

<sup>1</sup> שיי"ע או"ח, סי' קס"ו, סעי' ה'

<sup>2</sup> שו"ת תורה לשמה, סי' ת"ק ■