

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Disputes between R' Ami and R' Assi

Three disagreements regarding verses are recorded.

A Baraisa is cited that contrasts curses made by man and curses made by Hashem.

2) The affliction of the manna (cont.)

The Jewish People mentioned the "fish" they ate in Egypt in their complaint that led to the manna. Rav and Shmuel disagree whether they referred to actual fish or to illicit relations.

The rationale for each opinion is explained and analyzed.

After a number of challenges, the Gemara succeeds in proving that the position that understands "fish" literally must also include illicit relations as part of the Jewish People's complaint.

R' Ami and R' Assi disagree regarding why the Jewish People mentioned five specific foods.

The Torah's descriptions of the manna are elucidated.

A Baraisa relates how the manna was effective in determining who was correct when two people had a monetary dispute.

The way the manna fell is described.

The substance of the manna and its accompanying gifts are explained.

The Gemara mentions how the manna possessed many different tastes.

A lesson is derived from the way Hashem responded to the different food requests made by the Jewish People.

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

The curse of the serpent—A lesson in אמונה

בא וראה שלא כמדת הקב"ה וכו' קלל את הנחש. עולה לגג מזונותיו עמו, יורד למטה וכו'.

Beis Yitzchok on the Torah notes that the fate of the serpent was that his food was to be readily available. Hashem guarantees that his needs would always be met and his concerns satisfied. How is this a curse?

Hashem arranged the nature of the world so that as a creature is introduced into the world, its sustenance is also available. We confirm this in the berachah we say after eating: "בורא נפשות רבות וחסרונן"—Hashem creates many living souls, and all that they lack." Thus, the serpent, even in his state of being cursed, cannot be denied his basic rations. The curse, however, is that the serpent is to be rejected and banished from before Hashem. It is as if Hashem proclaims, "Although I take responsibility for your needs, I do not want to have anything to do with you. Here is what you need, take it and be gone!" In reference to other animals we find (Tehillim 104:21): "The young lions roar after their prey, and to seek their food from Hashem." This verse uses the lion as representative of the entire animal kingdom, and how its reliance upon Hashem is direct. This creates a relationship of dependence, and the animals thereby fulfill their mission in creation. The serpent, however, is out of this circle. He has been "cursed" with a sense of complacency, and he has no need to gaze to the heavens to beseech Hashem for his life. This is truly a condition where Hashem showed disapproval and rejection of the serpent.

It is with this perspective that we can appreciate the words of Ohr HaChaim (Shemos 17:3), "The nation thirsted there for water." The Ohr HaChaim notes that the people had just crossed the Yam Suf, and they had experienced a spiritual boost which culminated with the spontaneous singing of the Shiras HaYam. Why would Hashem confront them immediately with a challenge of lacking water to the point of their very lives being threatened? The lesson is that Hashem showed the people that maintaining a level of yiras shomayim meant that they should always keep their eyes fixed toward Heaven to daven to Him. This is a fundamental principle in אמונה and in the development of one's soul in the service of Hashem. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. How should a person alleviate their worries?

2. Where did the manna fall in proximity to people's homes?

3. Why is there a difference between the way שלו is spelled and the way it is pronounced?

4. What two interpretations are offered to explain the phrase לחם אבירים?

HALACHAH Highlight

How much do women eat?

וכן איש ואשה שבאו לפני משה לדין... אם נמצא עומרה בבית בעלה... נמצא עומרה בבית אביה וכו'.

Similarly, [when] a man and woman came before Moshe for judgment ... If her omer was found by her husband's house ... and if it was found by her father's house, etc.

The Shita Mekubetses¹ notes a contradiction between a Gemara in Eruvin and a Gemara in Kesubos. The Gemara in Kesubos writes that the daily amount of food a husband must provide his wife is the equivalent of two meals, which is equal to the volume of six eggs². Yet the Gemara in Eruvin writes that the healthy amount a person should eat daily is a tenth of an eifah, which equals the volume of forty-three and one-fifth eggs³. He writes in the name of the students of Rabbeinu Yonah, that women, who did not engage in hard labor, did not have the same appetite as the men. Therefore, the Gemara in Kesubos assigns women a smaller quantity of food than that of men as the Gemara in Eruvin relates⁴.

Rav Wolf Aleskar⁵ challenges this resolution from our Gemara that relates that Moshe Rabbeinu would decide on disputes between husband and wife by tracking where the woman's omer would appear. The reference to the "woman's omer" clearly indicates that women eat the vol-

(Overview...Continued from page 1)

The Gemara discusses the eating habits of the Jewish People and the incident related to their request for meat.

The Gemara continues to discuss the שלו birds and the manna. ■

ume of an omer, and there is no distinction between men and women in this issue.

The Noda B'Yehudah⁶ refutes Rav Aleskar's challenge and maintains that an omer of manna fell for every person regardless of how much he or she would actually consume. Disputes were decided based on the location where the manna fell rather than by the quantity that fell, as the two examples cited in the Gemara indicate. Therefore, our Gemara is not relevant to the discussion of the issue addressed by the Shita Mekubetses. ■

1. שיטה מקובצת מסכת כתובות סד ד"ה לא יפחות לה וז"ל, "והקשו רבנו צרפת ז"ל היאך אפשר שבזה היעור יספיק לה דהא אמרינן בפרק כיצד משתתפין ת"ר ראשית עריסותיכם כדי עיסתכם כדי עיסת מדבר מכאן אמרו כל האוכל במדה זו הרי זה ברוך ומבורך פחות מזה הרי זה מקולקל במעיו הנה שעל האוכל פחות מעומר ביום אמרו שהוא מקולקל במעיו והעומר הוא שני קבין פחות חומש וכו'"
2. גמ' כתובות סד לדעת ר' יוחנן בן ברוקה
3. גמ' עירובין פג
4. שיטה מקובצת שם וז"ל "עוד דנשים מתוך שאינם עוסקים במלאכה כמו האיש אינן אוכלו' כל כך תלמידי ר' יונה ז"ל"
5. מובא דעתו בשו"ת נודע ביהודה מהד"ק או"ח סי' ל"ז
6. שו"ת נדע ביהודה שם סי' ל"ח ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Complete absorption

דבר שנבלע במאתים וארבעים ושמונה אברים

Every food in the world has some extraneous matter in it, and this matter ultimately becomes waste. The Chasam Sofer, zt"l, explains that the exception to this rule was the manna—the unique food sent to the generation that received the Torah—that also lacks any extraneous element. Every part of Torah is essential, and this includes the aggadata as well. We can now better understand why the Divine punishment meted out to one who laughs at the words of the Sages is immersion in boiling waste. The scoffer is really saying that the words of the Sages are extraneous, ח"ו. The

vehicle of his punishment is extraneous waste. And this matter is boiling, to atone for mocking the words of the Sages that are likened to blazing coals.

This relates to the statement on our daf that the manna is called גד לבן because it is like the aggadata which has the power to inspire everyone's heart (לבו של אדם). Even though aggadata contains all the secrets of the Torah, it also has a simple level that can be understood by all. Those on a higher level grasp the esoteric meaning, while those on a simple level grasp the straightforward rendering. One must be on a very high level to know which aggadata are strictly allegorical, and which can also be understood literally.

During his younger years, the Chazon Ish, zt"l, lived in Minsk where a certain talmid chacham often shared

his table. Once, the scholar mentioned the aggadata in Berachos that states that Og Melech HaBashan uprooted a mountain three parsos square to lob onto the Jewish camp to destroy it.

The visitor stated, "It seems obvious that this can only be an exaggeration." The Chazon Ish responded immediately, "It is forbidden to make such statements!"

That Friday night, the Chazon Ish would not allow his guest to handle the wine. "I fear that if you touch it, it could be considered יין נסך." Although his visitor protested, the Chazon Ish remained firm.

He said, "I'll only take back my statement if you will immediately repent of your words and make a resolution not to say such a thing about the words of Chazal ever again!" ■

