



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying R' Yishmael's position (cont.)

The Gemara concludes its challenge to Rabba's assertion that R' Yishmael and R' Yishmael the son of R' Yochanan ben Berokah subscribe to the same position so Rabba revises his explanation.

This explanation is also rejected.

R' Ashi suggests another Tanna that subscribes to the same opinion of R' Yishmael.

This suggestion is also rejected.

2) Slaughtering two Chatas offerings on Shabbos when only one is needed

Rabbah or R' Ami rule that if one slaughtered two Chatas korbanos on Shabbos when only one was necessary he is liable for the second one but exempt from the first one even if atonement was achieved with the second animal and even if the first animal was discovered to be lean.

The last point is unsuccessfully challenged.

Ravina inquires about whether one would be liable for slaughtering the second animal if the first animal is discovered to be lean internally.

R' Ashi answers from a position shared by Rabbah and Rava that it is a person's intent that is important.

A second version of R' Ashi's response is presented.

3) Desecrating Shabbos for an ill person

Rabbah rules that if ten people run to get an ill person a dried fig and he only needed one they are exempt.

Rava inquires about the halacha in a case of a person who requires two dried figs and he can obtain two dried figs from two stems or three dried figs from a single stem. Which is preferable?

The Gemara answers that it is obvious that he should take the three dried figs from a single stem.

4) MISHNAH: The Mishnah discusses where the barley for the Omer should be taken.

5) Barley

Two reasons are given for why the barley should come from near Yerushalayim.

6) Obtaining wheat and barley from distant places

A Baraisa elaborates on the incidents in which it was necessary to obtain the barley and wheat from distant places.

The Gemara continues to elaborate on this incident.

Another incident that illustrates Mordechai's understanding of people's intention is presented. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Increasing the amount — ריבוי בשיעורים

חולה שאמדוהו לשתי גרוגרות ויש שתי גרוגרות בשתי עוקצין ושלש בעוקץ אחת הי מינייהו מייתין

Rabba taught if a certain sick person needed to eat a fig on Shabbos in order to remain alive, and ten different people immediately ran and each cut off a fig for him, they are each exempt from having violated Shabbos. Even if they ended up bringing the figs to him one after the other, and even if the sick person was revived after eating the first one, each one who brought a fig is credited with merit for being quick to try to save a life.

Rava presented the following inquiry. On Shabbos, a sick man needed two figs in order to survive. Two figs are available to be picked from a tree, one on each of two branches, and a third branch had three figs. Which combination of two figs should be cut from the tree for this sick person? Should we cut the two branches with single figs, which entails two acts of violating Shabbos, or should we cut the one branch with the three figs, which requires only one act of cutting a branch, although we will be cutting three figs at once, which is more than we need?

The Gemara concludes that it is obvious that we cut the one branch, with one act of violating the Shabbos, even though it results in cutting three figs, which is more than we need.

Ra"n notes that the Gemara's inquiry indicates that if there were two branches to choose from, one with two figs on it and the other with three figs on it, that it would obviously be prohib-

Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. Explain the principle כיון דאפשר לא טרחינן.
2. What is the point of dispute between Rabbah and Rava?
3. Why is it preferable for the barley for the Omer to be taken from near Yerushalayim?
4. Why did Chazal curse one who teaches his son Greek wisdom?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
לע"נ ר' מיכאל בן ר' שלמה יהודה Breiner ז"ל,
sponsored by his children

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
The Starr Family
לז"נ הרב זעליג בן דוד, ע"ה
Rabbi Selig Starr

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mr. and Mrs. Jonah Bruck
In loving memory of their grandfather
ר' שלום בן ר' שמעון, ע"ה
Mr. Samuel Bruck o.b.m.

HALACHAH Highlight

The value of fulfilling a mitzvah in its preferred manner

כחושה ואחר כך שמינה פטור

If he slaughtered the thin one and then the fat one he is exempt

Someone once asked Chacham Tzvi¹ to comment on the value and importance of performing a mitzvah in a more preferred manner (מצוה מן המובחר). He answered by citing our Gemara. The Gemara teaches that if on Shabbos a person has two Chatas animals, one fat and the other thin, and he first slaughtered the thin animal and then slaughtered the fat animal he is exempt from liability for slaughtering an unneeded animal. Furthermore, we would even instruct him to bring the fatter animal even though he already slaughtered the thin animal and slaughtering unnecessarily on Shabbos violates a Biblical prohibition. The rationale behind this ruling is that the preferred manner of fulfilling one's obligation to offer a Chatas is to bring the fattest one that is available. The fact that we would slaughter a second animal on Shabbos to be able to fulfill the mitzvah in the preferred manner illustrates the importance of fulfilling a mitzvah in its preferred manner.

Another example of this principle is found in Terumas Hadeshen². He writes that anytime one is not concerned that he may miss the time for kiddush levana he should wait to recite kiddush levana until Motzei Shabbos since reciting kiddush levana on Motzei Shabbos is the preferred time to fulfill the mitzvah. Although the Gemara Zevachim (91a) teaches that when a mitzvah presents itself one should fulfill that mitzvah right away, nevertheless, we would pass over the opportunity to perform a mitzvah now to be able to fulfill it later in a more preferred manner. Chacham Tzvi then adds that he recalls a similar halacha recorded in Sefer Chassidim, although it is not found in our editions. Sefer Chassidim writes that if within a Sefer Torah there is a section of parchment

(Overview...continued from page 1)

ited to cut the branch with three figs on it. This is called ריבוי בשיעורים, increasing the measure, and it is prohibited.

Ra"n asks that this seems inconsistent with a Gemara in Beitzta (17a) which discusses cooking and baking on Yom Tov, which is allowed for Yom Tov needs. The Gemara there states that it is permitted for a woman to fill a pot with many pieces of meat, although she only needs one piece. Similarly, a baker may fill the oven with loaves and bake them all, although she only needs one loaf for Yom Tov. Why is this increase in measure allowed on Yom Tov, when we said it is prohibited in the context of Shabbos? Ra"n cites an answer given by Rashba. When we are already performing an act which is permitted, increasing the amount while cooking or when cutting is only prohibited rabbinically. Therefore, when dealing with Shabbos, whose violation carries the capital punishment of stoning, we are stringent and we prohibit this increase. However, regarding Yom Tov, whose violation is less severe, we are lenient, and we allow increase of cooking and baking.

Ra"n proves from our Gemara that increase in amount is a Torah prohibition. If it were only rabbinic, Rava's inquiry should have an obvious resolution to cut one branch and not two. It must be that cutting a branch with more figs than necessary is a serious violation, and this is why Rava presents his question. ■

whose writing is not preferred and then a scribe becomes available it is preferred to exchange the existing section of parchment with one that is more beautiful. Even though switching sections of parchment entails removing the inferior quality parchment from the Sefer Torah, this is nevertheless the preferred approach since it allows for fulfillment of the mitzvah in the preferred manner. ■

1. שו"ת חכם צבי סי' מ"ה.

2. שו"ת תרומת הדשן סי' ל"ה. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Worst Form of Impurity

"נעץ צפורניו בחומה..."

Rav Yosef Chaim Sonnenfeld, zt"l, gave a penetrating analysis of a statement on today's daf. "In Menachos 64 we find that when the Chashmonai kings were at war, every day the besiegers would bring lambs which would be lifted over the wall and used for the korban tamid. An old man turned traitor and told the besiegers that they would not conquer as long as the occupiers continue to supply the besieged with animals for the offerings. The next day the besiegers sent up a pig instead of the lambs.

When it was halfway up the wall it stuck its hooves into the wall and an area of three hundred parsah square in Eretz Yisrael quaked.

"This Gemara is surely thought provoking. We may wonder why they sent specifically a pig. Also, what is the meaning of the term that Eretz Yisrael shook, 'three hundred parsah by three hundred parsah.'

"We can understand the answer by considering that even from ancient times there was always a fight between those who lean towards foreign secular wisdom and those faithful to Jewish tradition. These enemies were the forerunners of the various 'reforming' movements of today. They chose a pig specifically since a pig has split hooves, the outward sign of a kosher ani-

mal. It is specifically when the pig displays its hooves, trying to show that it is kosher, and endeavors to scale the city walls and defile the mikdash that the very land quakes. Such duplicity is dangerous for our nation's very survival.

"The danger presented by people distanced from the Torah who act as though they are faithful is much greater than that presented by outright apostates or the like. It is precisely because the pig has split hooves yet is not kosher that it alludes to the worst impurity. Our sages warned us to stay away from the hypocrites who destroy many more souls than those who are openly against us." ■

1. חכמת חיים, ע' קפ"ט ■

