

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Clarifying the dispute (cont.)

R' Ashi explains that there were two enactments regarding me'ilah and the ashes of the parah adumah.

### 2) Paying for the communal error bull and the he-goats for idolatry

A Baraisa presents a disagreement between R' Yehudah and R' Shimon as to who funds the communal error bull and the he-goats for idolatry.

Another Baraisa has the opinions reversed.

The Rabbis suggested that the first Baraisa's version is more accurate but R' Ashi rejects this assertion.

The Gemara proves that the first Baraisa's version is the more accurate.

### 3) Offering the chavitin whole

R' Chiya bar Abba reports that R' Yochanan inquired whether the Mishnah meant that a whole issaron was brought in the morning and another whole issaron was brought in the afternoon or that a whole issaron was brought in the morning and nothing was brought in afternoon.

Rava makes two attempts to prove that a whole issaron is offered in the morning and another issaron is offered in the afternoon.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok cites a Baraisa that also maintains that a whole issaron is brought in the morning and another whole issaron is brought in the afternoon.

### 4) The frankincense offered with the chavitin

R' Yochanan reports that Abba Yosi ben Dostai and Rabanan disagree whether under normal circumstances a kometz of frankincense was offered in the morning and another kometz in the afternoon or only a single kometz was taken and divided half in the morning and half in the afternoon.

The point of the dispute is explained.

R' Yochanan inquires about the quantity of frankincense offered when the Kohen Gadol dies and another Kohen Gadol is not chosen.

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Explain R' Yochanan's inquiry?
2. What is the point of dispute between Abba Yosi ben Dostai and Rabanan?
3. How does R' Yochanan rule regarding the dispute between Abba Yosi ben Dostai and Rabanan?
4. How was a Mincha made into chometz?

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Incomplete development of chametz

רבי יהודה אומר אף היא אינה מן המובחר וכו'

The fifth chapter of Menachos begins by informing us that all minchah offerings were brought as matzah, unleavened, except for two cases. Ten of the forty loaves brought with a todah were chametz, and the two loaves brought on Shavuot, the shteihalechem, were chametz.

How was this leavening process conducted? Rabbi Meir explains that sourdough, an agent used to ferment the dough, was selected from within the dough itself rather than using an external pieced of sourdough, thus ensuring that the required volume of the dough will not be exceeded. Rabbi Yehuda contends that this process of fermenting the dough is not a choice method, because it is not fully effective. Rather, R' Yehuda suggests that a piece of sourdough that is fully active is brought and placed into an empty measuring vessel. The flour needed to supplement the volume of an issaron is added. The dough will now ferment properly, and the required volume of dough will not be exceeded.

The Gri"z explains that the disagreement between R' Meir and R' Yehuda can be understood to be an expression of these same views in a Mishnah in Pesachim (48b). As dough begins to ferment, it progresses through several phases. As it warms, its surface begins to pale. This is called הכסיפו פניה. Immediately at this point, R' Meir considers it to be שאור, which Rashi explains is incompletely fermented dough. R' Meir holds one would be liable for lashes if he eats from it on Pesach. R' Yehuda disagrees and he considers dough whose surface has begun to pale to still be unleavened, and it is permitted on Pesach.

As the process continues, the surface of the dough begins to develop a slight a series of cracks, which are described as being similar to the antenna of grasshoppers which branch into several directions. This advanced stage indicates that the dough is now fully chametz, according to R' Meir, while R' Yehuda holds that it is now שאור, which is no longer matzah, but it is not yet chametz.

We see that according to R' Meir, whether the dough has begun to pale or if it develops surface cracks, it is a form of chametz. According to R' Yehuda these stages of fermenting are not yet chametz.

We can now explain that in our case, R' Meir is willing to suggest that we use sourdough from the dough of the minchah itself, although it is of a lesser-quality, because R' Meir holds that even if it only succeeds to cause the minchah to develop surface cracks, this is still considered to be chametz. R' Yehuda holds that this is inadequate, because he holds that the level of having the surface cracks is not considered chametz. He therefore says that the sourdough must be taken from an outside source, in order for the fermenting process to be more complete. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Halachic ruling about korban-related matters

א"ר יוחנן הלכה כסתם משנה

R' Yochanan said that the halacha follows the anonymous Mishnah

The Gemara Zevachim (45a) records a conversation between Rav and R' Yosef. Rav issued a ruling regarding a disagreement between Tannaim about a Beis HaMikdash-related matter. R' Yosef was surprised by the ruling and raised the question, "Is this halacha for the era of Moshiach?" Abaye responded to R' Yosef that according to his perspective there is no reason to study any of the massechtos that deal with korbanos since they all involve matters related to the era of Moshiach. The reason we do in fact study these areas of Torah is to receive reward for the exposition of Torah even if it has no practical significance. Therefore, Rav's ruling falls into the same category of expositing Torah to receive reward. R' Yosef then explains that his astonishment was not that the material was being studied; rather it was the fact that Rav felt compelled to issue a halachic ruling about something that is not practical. Since the Gemara does not respond to R' Yosef's comment it seems that he was correct that there is no reason to issue halachic rulings about matters that do not fall into the category of practical halacha.

In our Gemara two Tannaim disagree whether the Kohen Gadol would bring one *kometz* of flour and use half in the morning and half in the afternoon to fulfill his *chavitin* obligation or did he bring a full *kometz* in the morning and a full *kometz* in the afternoon. R' Yochanan issued a ruling about this matter and then the Gemara teaches that there is a disagreement concerning R' Yochanan's position on this matter. What seems evident, however, is that there was a need to issue a ruling about the cor-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

The inquiry is further clarified.

Rava makes an unsuccessful attempt to resolve this inquiry.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok cites a Baraisa that he uses to prove that according to Rabanan the quantity is not doubled.

R' Yochanan rules in accordance with Abba Yosi ben Dostai.

A contradictory statement of R' Yochanan is cited.

The Gemara answers that there is dispute regarding R' Yochanan's position.

### הדרן עלך התכלת

5) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah lists the two menachos that are brought as chometz and then presents a dispute how the mincha is made into chometz.

6) **Making the Mincha from matzah**

R' Preida asked R' Ami for the source that the mincha must be made from matzah.

R' Ami expresses surprise at the question. ■

rect manner in which the *chavitin* was brought even though it is not practical halacha. This supports the assertion of Tosafos<sup>1</sup> that Amoraim other than R' Yosef did not have an issue with issuing halachic rulings about matters that will be practical only upon the rebuilding of the Beis HaMikdash. This sentiment is echoed in the introduction to the work *Likutei Halachos*<sup>2</sup> written by Chofetz Chaim about Gemaras that discuss korban-related matters. He commented that one should not be surprised that he is writing a halachic work about these topics since Rambam also issued definitive rulings about these matters indicating that R' Yosef's opinion about this matter is not accepted in halacha. ■

1. תוס' זבחים מ"ה. ד"ה הלכתא.

2. הקדמה הראשונה הערה ג' ד"ה ואל. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The Land of Light and Wisdom

"בבלאי טפשי משוד דיתבו באתרא חשוכא..."

Shortly after the Holocaust, when Rav Yisrael Grossman, zt"l, paid a visit to the Abir Yaakov of Sadigura, zt"l, he was surprised to find him in an exceptionally joyous mood. When the rebbe noticed Rav Grossman's surprise, he used a parable to explain why he was filled with joy despite the recent tragedy. "Imagine a poor Jew, beaten down and sickly, who has nowhere to even rest his head. If people have mercy and open their homes to him, he will surely be filled with boundless joy from grati-

tude.

"The Jewish people today are likened to this poor man. Although we endured such cruelty which resulted in the murder of millions of Jews, we must never lose sight of the positive. Now that we have entered Eretz Yisrael, which is our homeland, we are exactly like a poor displaced man who has finally found a home."

He added, "You might argue that the spiritual level here is not exactly optimal. Nevertheless, the very fact that Hashem has brought us back home after such a tragedy is also enough to make us joyous!"<sup>1</sup>

The Kaftor VaFerach, zt"l, learns the greatness of Eretz Yisrael from a statement on today's daf. "The Midrash Rabbah explains that the verse (Bereshis 2:12), 'וזהב

הארץ ההיא טוב — the gold of that land was good,' refers to the spiritual gold of Torah. 'There is no Torah like the Torah of Eretz Yisrael and there is no wisdom like the wisdom of Eretz Yisrael.'<sup>2</sup> In Bava Basra (158b) we find that the very air of Eretz Yisrael imparts understanding of Torah. In Menachos we see that when Rav Avin told over a teaching to Rav Yirmiyah, his hearer criticized those who live in Bavel saying that they were fools who lived in a place of darkness. This is in contrast with Eretz Yisrael, whose very air is the breath of Hashem."<sup>3</sup> ■

1. במחיצתם של גדולי ישראל, ח"ב, ע' 220

2. בראשית רבה, פרשה ט"ז

3. כפתור ופרח, פרק י' ■