

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Lechem hapanim (cont.)

R' Yochanan's view concerning the shape of the lechem hapanim is unsuccessfully challenged.

A Baraisa is cited in support of R' Yochanan.

The Gemara inquires whether the lechem hapanim became invalidated during the journeys in the wilderness.

It is reported that R' Yochanan and R' Yehoshua ben Levi disagree about this point.

The exchange between these two positions is recorded and along the way qualifications to the point of dispute are added.

At the end of the discussion Ravin is cited who maintains that R' Yochanan and R' Yehoshua ben Levi do not disagree and each one refers to a different circumstance.

Abaye draws a lesson from an earlier-cited Baraisa and the Gemara explains the novelty of Abaye's comment.

Another Baraisa is cited that contradicts an earlier Baraisa that stated that at the time of removal zavim and metzoraim were sent out of the encampments.

R' Ashi explains that the two Baraisos represent different opinions and the Baraisa that presents R' Eliezer's position is cited.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses where the Two Loaves and lechem hapanim were prepared and that their preparation does not override Shabbos prohibitions.

3) Clarifying the Mishnah

A contradiction regarding the ability of a solid measure to sanctify its contents is noted.

The Gemara's initial understanding of the contradic-

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between R' Yochanan and R' Yehoshua ben Levi?
.....
2. How do we know that the Jewish People travelled at night?
.....
3. Where were the two loaves and lechem hapanim prepared?
.....
4. How does R' Avahu bar Kahana explain the dispute between R' Yehudah and R' Shimon?
.....

Distinctive INSIGHT

Baking the loaves with extra care

אמר רב אשי מאי קושיא דלמא מאי מבפנים במקום זריזין

The Gemara presents what seems to be a contradiction in the Mishnah. We are first taught that the kneading and arranging of the two loaves of Shavuot and the lechem hapanim is done outside the courtyard of the Mikdash, which indicates that the measuring vessel used to measure the flour was not sanctified. If it had been a sanctified vessel, it would have caused the flour measured in it to become holy, and the flour would no longer have been able to be kneaded outside the courtyard. Yet, the Mishnah then reports that these loaves were baked inside the courtyard. This requirement indicates that the loaves were holy, and they therefore could not be baked beyond the area of the Mikdash.

The Gemara first presents a simple solution to resolve the rulings of the Mishnah. Perhaps the flour was not sanctified with the measuring vessels, which were themselves not sanctified. Perhaps the ovens sanctified the loaves as they were baked. Rava quickly notes that Rav Sheishes was a brilliant and sharp scholar, and his question was obviously not as simple as it seems.

Rather, the question regarding the Mishnah was a different one. We see that the baking of the loaves was done in the courtyard, indicating that the oven sanctified the loaves. Yet, we know that the baking of the loaves was not allowed on Shabbos. This necessarily required that these sanctified loaves were only placed on the Shulchan the next day, on Shabbos afternoon. Did this not cause these sanctified loaves to become disqualified by being left off the Shulchan overnight?

Once again, the Gemara is convinced that there would be a simple answer to this question. Rav Ashi suggests that the Mishnah did not mean that the baking was actually done inside the courtyard, where the oven would have sanctified the loaves. Rather, it was done in a place of extreme care and diligence. The kohanim baked the dough for these loaves outside the courtyard, but, according to Rashi, it was done in a manner of special care and caution so that the loaves not become chametz. This response of Rav Ashi is rejected, however, because if such care was necessary for the baking, it certainly would have been critical for the earlier stages of kneading and arranging, as well.

Noda b'Yehuda notes that the response of Rav Ashi needs to be understood. We were discussing not only the

(Continued on page 2)

HALACHAH Highlight

Commemorating the Two Loaves offered on Shavuos

ופיה דומה כמין טבלא מרובעת

Its mouth is similar to a square form

The Gemara teaches that the Lechem Hapanim was made square. Rambam¹ also rules that the Lechem Hapanim is to be square and explains that the term פנים – “faces” indicates that the loaves are to have many faces. Rambam² also writes that the Two Loaves offered on Shavuos were also made square. Kiryas Melech³ traces this ruling to a Tosefta that reports that there was a chamber in the Beis HaMikdash that contained an oven that was square in shape and was used for baking the lechem hapanim and the Two Loaves.

Kol Bo⁴ reports that there was a custom that the loaves that were baked for Shavuos were baked rectangular and the basis of the custom was to have loaves that would commemorate the Two Loaves that were offered on Shavuos. The concept of making special loaves for Shavuos is also mentioned by Rema⁵. He writes that there is a custom in some places to eat dairy food on the first day of Shavuos. He explains that just as on Pesach we have two cooked foods, one to commemorate the Pesach and the second to commemorate the Chagiga, so too on Shavuos we eat dairy and then meat so that one will require two loaves since one may not use a single loaf for dairy and meat, in order to have a commemoration of the Two

(Insight...continued from page 1)

lechem hapanim, but the two loaves of Shavuos also. If the diligence of the kohanim prevented the loaves from becoming chametz, this only applies to the lechem hapanim, but the two loaves of Shavuos are supposed to be chametz. What diligence was necessary for them? Noda b'Yehuda answers that care was only applied to the lechem hapanim to prevent their becoming chametz. Yet, in order not to differentiate, the two loaves of Shavuos were baked in the same place, although without the added precautions. ■

Loaves that were offered on Shavuos. Magen Avrohom⁶ adds that the loaves should be made from wheat since the Two Loaves offered on Shavuos were made from wheat.

Despite the different customs related to making special loaves on Shavuos, the practice was not established as binding halacha as is the practice to have the two cooked foods on Pesach. The reason for the distinction, explains Rav Moshe Feinstein⁷, is that the Two Loaves were eaten only by kohanim in the courtyard of the Beis HaMikdash as opposed to the korbanos that are commemorated on Pesach that were eaten by everyone. ■

1. רמב"ם פ"ה מהל' תמידין ומוספין ה"ט.
2. רמב"ם שם פ"ח ה"י.
3. קרית מלך שם.
4. כל בו סי' נ"ב.
5. רמ"א סי' תצ"ד סעי' ג'.
6. מג"א שם.
7. אג"מ אור"ח ח"א סי' ק"ס. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Source of the Question

”ומנו רב ששת”

While it may be common for a person who has a sharp intellect to feel distinguished when he comes up with insightful questions on what he learns, it is a wrong-headed behavior. The Meor Einayim, ז"ל, mentions this tendency and explains that it shows a marked lack of perspective.

He asked, “How could a person studying the Toras Hashem not understand his learning? If he has a strong question, this is merely a reflection of his own flaws. I therefore don't understand the mindset of lamdanim who are proud of their questions—the more difficult the

question the more pride. Shouldn't one feel ashamed if due to his sins he doesn't understand? Being prideful instead of introspectively thoughtful about this is nothing less than an error. Who knows if he has a strong question due to a serious spiritual failing?”

The Rav of Dzikov, ז"ל, explains why this is not difficult from a statement on today's daf. “In Menachos 95 we find that a man asked a question as hard as iron. Who was it? Rav Sheishes. Apparently, asking a difficult question is a reason to take pride. But according to the Meor Einayim having a question is a disgrace since it highlights the questioner's sins!”

He concluded, “In order to understand why this is not a contradiction, we must consider who Rav Sheishes was. The Gemara tells us that he was blind. A

blind man is not obligated in mitzvos. The Pri Megadim adds that this includes even negative mitzvos. This is why specifically Rav Sheishes can take pride in his question. Since he is not obligated in Torah his question cannot be a result of his sins!”¹ ■

1. עטרת ישועה, לקוטים, דף צ' ■

(Overview...continued from page 1)

tion is resolved and another contradiction is noted.

R' Ashi resolved this contradiction but the Gemara then relates that this resolution is erroneous and the contradiction is not resolved.

R' Avahu bar Kahana asserts that R' Yehudah and R' Shimon derive their respective positions from the same pasuk.

This explanation is rejected. ■