

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The Chamber of Lambs (cont.)

R' Ada the son of R' Yitzchak returns to the original contradiction regarding the location of the Chamber of Lambs. He suggests that the chamber was on the west drawn a bit to the north and a bit to the south. Therefore, it could appear, depending on one's vantage point, either to the north or to the south.

R' Ada the son of R' Yitzchak further asserts that the Chamber of Lambs was more to the south. This assertion is based on the way R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua answers a contradiction concerning the location of the Chamber of the Lechem HaPanim.

The Gemara unsuccessfully challenges R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua's resolution to the contradiction regarding the location of the Chamber of the Lechem HaPanim.

2) The rights of the Kohen Gadol

A Baraisa teaches the extent of the right of the Kohen Gadol to offer any korban he chooses and to take a portion of any korban he wants.

The Gemara notes a contradiction within the Baraisa regarding the right of the Kohen Gadol to take loaves from a korban.

Abaye presents a resolution to the contradiction. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. According to R' Ada the son of R' Yitzchak, where was the Chamber of Lambs located?

2. What is the contradiction concerning the Chamber of the Lechem HaPanim?

3. When does the rule "Every turn etc." not apply?

4. How many loaves from the Lechem HaPanim did the Kohen Gadol take?

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Mr. & Mrs. Fred Goldman
In loving memory of their mother
מרת מאשה זלפה בת אברהם ע"ה*

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Dr. and Mrs. Yaakov Weil
in honor of the birth and bris of their son*

Distinctive INSIGHT

The privilege of the Kohen Gadol to officiate and take the first portion

כיצד מקריב חלק בראש אומר עולה זו אני מקריב מנחה זו אני מקריב. כיצד נוטל חלק בראש אומר חטאת זו אני אוכל אשם זה אני אוכל

Sefer ארי גבורת notes that the examples used to illustrate the privileges of the Kohen Gadol are varied. Regarding exercising his right to officiate over an offering, the examples used are an olah and a minchah. In illustrating his choosing to take a portion to eat, though, the examples used are a chattas and asham. Why did the Baraisa not use the same examples throughout?

The illustration of officiating uses an olah and a minchah. An olah is completely burned on the Altar. So, too, we infer that the minchah discussed is one which is totally burned on the Altar. This refers to a minchah of a kohen, as we find (Vayikra 6:16). This teaches us a fascinating halachah. The Kohen Gadol has the right to step in and take over the processing of an offering, even if it is the personal offering of the kohen who would otherwise be officiating. Normally, the family group of kohanim who are serving have priority status in officiating at the service. The exception to this is where a kohen comes and brings his own offering. The kohen-owner is allowed to bring his own offering, and the current family kohanim do not take charge (see Bava Kamma 109b). The Kohen Gadol, however, is special, in that he can take over and officiate even at the personal offering of another kohen.

We might also assume that the privilege of the Kohen Gadol to take the first portion only applies to an offering in whose service he participated. This would be an extension of the normal halachah that the kohen who officiates at an offering has a mitzvah to eat from it. Although all other kohanim may also eat from it, their pieces may be even less than a כזית. The kohen who officiates, however, must fulfill the mitzvah by eating at least a כזית from the meat. The lesson of our Gemara, however, is that the Kohen Gadol may eat from any edible offering, even though he did not participate in the service of that offering at all. This is hinted at in the fact that the Baraisa did not illustrate the halachah of the סיפא using the case of olah, and it changed the type of offering (chattas or asham) in describing the privilege of his partaking of any portion he wished. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Honoring the Kohen

שכהו גדול מקריב חלק בראש ונוטל חלק בראש

The Kohen Gadol offers up korbanos first and takes the first portion.

Kesef Mishna¹ writes that in the opinion of Rambam the Kohen Gadol has the first right to take the nicest portion, even when he did not officiate at its service. This is similar to the honor that non-kohanim must accord Kohanim² based on the Mitzvah of "and you shall sanctify him." Nonetheless, there is a difference between these two cases. The mitzvah to honor the Kohen Gadol is a mitzvah to honor the person himself, whereas the obligation to honor Kohanim refers to the collective group of Kohanim and

not necessarily a specific person. Therefore, according to some Poskim³ if there is one serving plate, as is commonly found in yeshivos, non-kohanim only have to defer to one Kohen because once they have deferred to a Kohen they have fulfilled their duty to honor Kohanim. Once the mitzvah is fulfilled they do not have to allow all of the Kohanim to take before them. Similarly, there are Poskim who opine⁴ that blemished Kohanim or Kohanim who are minors are considered Kohanim for the mitzvah of "and you shall sanctify him." Although they are not fit to work in the Beis HaMikdash the mitzvah will still apply since they are part of the group of Kohanim. ■

1. הלכות כלי המקדש פ"ה ה"ב
2. וכמש"כ המשנה ברורה סימן ר"א ס"ק י"ג
3. שו"ת בצל החכמה סימן ס'. והובא בפס"ת סימן קס"ז 152
4. פס"ת סימן קכ"ח אות צ"ד ליקט בזה הרבה אחרונים. והביא מהכתב סופר מנחת חינוך מהרש"ם ודובב מישרים שמספק דאורייתא יחמיר גם בכהן בעל מום וקטן. ועע"ש שיש בו דרשה מקרא לרבות את אלו, והטעם מובן עפ"י מש"כ בפנים ■

STORIES Off the Daf

What is bread?

לחם הפנים אלחם הפנים

In this world, material temptation stands in opposition to holiness, but when we struggle to overcome evil, we bring about a revelation of Divine sanctity in the world. This is because evil stems from Hashem's desire to see us overcome temptation; when we do so, the temptation itself reveals that its source is in the Creator, and that all is ultimately good. Everything emanates from Hashem, and at the Source, the כלל, all is truly One. However, as soon as there is individuation emerging

from God's Essence, once we enter the realm of the פרט, there appears to be an actual separation from Hashem. This is why the terrestrial beings require the two breads of the offering of Shavuot, or the double line of the lechem hapanim that face one another. The Sfas Emes, זט"ל, explains that one loaf (or one side of the 12 loaves) represents the rectified state called כלל and in human terms this means having our general goals straight. The second "side," the פרט, has to be "facing" the first, so that we can work on the details of our lives to align ourselves with our overall goals.

Rav Shlomo Wolbe, זט"ל, told a story about his experiences during the Holocaust years, that sheds light on this concept:

"I lived for eight years in a re-

mote area of Sweden. In my community there was barely a minyan of shomrei Shabbos. During those years, in that part of Europe, nearly all of the people responsible for providing religious services went off the Torah path. I was there, all alone, and the only reason why I was able to hold my own as a ben-Torah was by maintaining an absolute commitment to my daily mus-sar regimen. Without this, who knows to what depths I would have fallen? That was what gave me the strength to overcome the trials I faced so I could do Hashem's Will.

"I don't see anything special in this, though," he said with disarming modesty. "It would be like being proud of staying healthy during a famine by eating enough bread every day!" ■

