

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Partners

A Baraisa presents the source that one partner may not lean on a korban on behalf of another partner.

A kal vachomer is suggested that would allow partners to lean on the korban for one another.

The kal vachomer is rejected.

The Mishnah's statement that there is no leaning on slaughtered animals is unsuccessfully challenged.

הדרן עלך שתי מדות

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the preparation and baking of the Two Loaves and the lechem hapanim.

3) Kneading one at a time

A Baraisa presents the source that the loaves were kneaded one at a time.

An exposition in the Baraisa is unsuccessfully challenged.

4) Lechem hapanim

A Baraisa teaches that the lechem hapanim was made in a mold and that there were three different molds used in the process of making the lechem hapanim.

R' Chanina and R' Yochanan disagree about the shape of the lechem hapanim.

Three unsuccessful challenges to R' Yochanan's opinion are recorded.

Two unsuccessful challenges to R' Chanina are presented.

A statement of R' Yehudah is cited and the Gemara explains that this statement is consistent with R' Yochanan's position. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the source that all the partners must lean on the korban?

2. How were the Two Loaves baked differently than the lechem hapanim?

3. What shape were the lechem hapanim?

4. Why did the lechem hapanim require props?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Lechem hapanim are baked two at a time

לחם הפנים נילושות אחת אחת ונאפות שתיים שתיים

The perek begins by teaching that the loaves of the lechem hapanim were kneaded separately, one at a time, but they were baked two at a time. The Gemara points out that this halacha is based upon the verse (Vayikra 24:5) which states that the flour should be taken and baked as twelve loaves. The verse emphasizes that the makeup of each loaf should be two issaron of flour, but the verse then notes that the loaves (plural) shall be placed in the oven to be baked. The indication that the kneading and the baking have differing rules is based upon the contrast between the first part of the verse which focuses upon kneading each loaf, and the later part of the verse which discusses baking loaves.

Sfas Emes considers whether the loaves must specifically be baked two at a time, no more and no less, or whether the verse is only instructing that the loaves not be baked one at a time, but that they may even be baked all twelve at once. He mentions that from the Rambam, in his Commentary to the Mishnah, it seems that they must be baked in sets of two at a time, and no more.

Minchas Chinuch (Mitzvah 97; #8) writes that it is clear to him that the verse is only instructing that they not be baked individually. He states that the loaves need not be baked specifically in sets of two, and that all twelve may even be baked simultaneously. In his comment to Toras Kohanim (Emor #18), ר"ש explains that the Torah's command to bake the loaves in pairs is a scriptural ruling, and it must be followed literally. He understands the reason for this halacha is that the loaves must be prepared with great scrutiny, and when baking more than two at a time the job becomes too difficult and the care for the loaves is too demanding. This opinion is unlike that of the Minchas Chinuch, and it is in line with the approach of Sfas Emes.

The Achronim note that the Gemara (72b, 95b) teaches that the lechem hapanim were sanctified in the oven in which they were baked. The rule is (Zevachim 88a) that the service vessels of the Mikdash do not sanctify items designated for an offering unless the entire amount needed is placed in the vessel at once. Lechem hapanim were a set of twelve loaves placed upon the Shulchan. How, then, could they be baked in the oven and sanctified two at a time, when two loaves is less than the full twelve?

HALACHAH Highlight

Inflated matzos

כיון דאפי לה נפחה

Once they baked it, it expanded

Rema¹ rules that if a matzah becomes inflated in the middle it is prohibited on Pesach. Mishnah Berurah² cites two definitions for what qualifies as an inflated matzah. One definition is that the dough split into an upper layer and a lower layer and the upper layer rose above the lower layer. The second definition is that the dough did not split into two; rather the dough itself rose similar to a loaf of bread that rises in the middle. Later authorities agree that one should be stringent and treat both matzahs as an inflated matzah and they should not be eaten. Furthermore³, he writes that when a matzah is inflated the entire matzah is prohibited and it is not sufficient to merely break off the part of the matzah that is inflated.

Chok Yaakov⁴ cites authorities who reject the second definition of an inflated matzah and cite our Gemara as proof that merely rising does not raise a concern for chometz. The Gemara discusses the manufacturing of the Lechem Hapanim and teaches that three different forms were used in the process of manufacturing them. The reason why a third form was necessary was that while baking it expanded and would no longer fit in the second form. The Lechem Hapanim was matzah and it would be invalid if it became chometz and nev-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Keren Orah suggests a novel approach. He says that the loaves were kneaded one at a time, and placed in the oven two at a time, but they were not baked until all twelve were in the oven together. In this manner, they became sanctified together.

Mikdash David (3:#3) explains that a service vessel's inability to sanctify an item unless the full amount for an offering is placed into it is only a restriction when a minchah is being prepared for a kemitzah to be taken from it. Lechem hapanim does not have a kemitzah taken from it, so this restriction does not apply. ■

ertheless its status was not negatively impacted by virtue of the fact that it expanded while baking.

Pri Megadim⁵ elaborating on a comment of Taz explains that if the matzah were to rise in the middle and form the shape of a mountain one must be concerned that the dough became chometz since rising into the shape of a mountain is an indication of leavening. If, however, the dough rises somewhat evenly there is no concern for leavening since the expansion of dough is a consequence of heat. That is why there was no concern that the Lechem Hapanim became chometz even though it expanded while baking. ■

1. רמ"א או"ח סי' תס"א סעי' ה'.
2. מ"ב שם ס"ק ל"ג.
3. מ"ב שם ס"ק ל"ד.
4. חק יעקב שם ס"ק י"ט.
5. פמ"ג משי"ז סק"ו. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Breads and the Lambs

"שתי הלחם..."

Today's daf begins Perek Shtei Halechem which discusses the two breads brought on Shavuos. The Rema, zt"l, explains why we bring the breads and two sheep on Shavuos.

He wrote, "The two sheep brought on Shavuos represent the shnei luchos habris as well as the dual declaration, נעשה ונשמע, through which we merited them. The two breads brought along with them allude to the oral Torah which corresponds to every element of the written Torah.

"This explains the halachah that if the shtei halechem are brought without

the two lambs they are accepted, but not vice versa. This teaches that the main thing is the oral Torah. One who delves in the oral torah and neglects the written Torah is considered to be in a post facto state of completion. But the person who delves only in the written Torah is compared to one who has no God, as our sages revealed. This is also why the two lambs must be alive while they are waved together with the breads. Yet the lambs are also waved since one who does not know the written Torah is sorely lacking. Clearly the written Torah is truly essential, otherwise why did God give it to us?

"Since the sacrifices brought on Shavuos symbolize the intrinsic wholeness of the Jewish people when we delve into the written and oral Torah, there is no sin offering brought in the musaf of Shavuos. The reason we wave the lambs and

bread in all six directions is to allude to the revelation at Sinai. On that great day God's voice was heard resonating from all directions. This is why the chest and foreleg of the lambs were waved again; this alludes to the waving of other sacrifices."

He concluded, "We wave both the foreleg—which alludes to actions—and the chest, which is called the חזה in Hebrew. The chest is where the heart is. It is called חזה, which also means vision, to teach that one perceives the Divine through a pure heart. We wave both to teach that a talmid chacham has to be תוכו כבדו — his actions and his heart must both be directed only to Hashem."¹ ■

1. תורת העולה, ח"ג, פי"ה ■