



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Rabbah raised an objection against him: The *lechem hapanim*¹ is eaten on the ninth,² the tenth, or the eleventh [day], neither earlier nor later. How so? Normally it is eaten on the ninth [day]: it is baked on the eve of the Shabbos [and] eaten on the Shabbos [of the following week], [which is] on the ninth. If a Festival occurred on the eve of the Shabbos, it is eaten on the Shabbos, on the tenth.³ [If] the two Festival days of Rosh Hashanah [occurred before the Shabbos], it is eaten on the Shabbos on the eleventh day, because it [the baking of the showbread] does not override either the Shabbos or the Festival. Now if you say [that] the requirements of the Shabbos may be prepared on a Festival, why does it not override the Festival?⁴ — Said he to him, A near shevus they permitted; a distant shevus they did not permit.⁵ Then according to Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, who said on the authority of Rabbi Shimon the son of the Segan: It overrides the Festival, but it does not override the fast-day,⁶ what is to be said?⁷ — They differ in this: one Master holds, They permitted a near shevus, [but] a distant shevus they did not permit; while the other Master holds: a distant shevus too they permitted.⁸ [Summary: We

learned that Rav Chisda maintains that biblically, the needs of Shabbos can be prepared on Yom Tov. Rav Chisda maintains that although the Chachamim permitted a rabbinic injunction for immediate needs, they did not permit a rabbinic injunction for something that will occur in the future. Thus, the baking of the *lechem hapanim* was not permitted on Yom Tov, because although rabbinic prohibitions were suspended with regard to the service in the Bais HaMikdash, this was only said regarding something that had to be performed that day. The *lechem hapanim*, however, was not going to be eaten until the following Shabbos, so one was not permitted to bake the *lechem hapanim* on Yom Tov. According to Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel who maintains that one can bake the *lechem hapanim* on Yom Tov, we must say that he maintains that a rabbinic injunction was permitted even for something that would occur in the future, i.e. the eating of the *lechem hapanim* on the following Shabbos.] (46b3 – 47a2)

¹ Which is the showbread that consisted of twelve loaves that were placed on the *Shulchan* in the Bais HaMikdash and remained there from one Shabbos to the next.

² It was baked on Friday and then it would be eaten on Shabbos of the following week, which is nine days after it was baked.

³ For then it was baked on Thursday.

⁴ Since baking on a Festival for the Shabbos (without an *eiruv tavshilin*) is thus but a Rabbinical prohibition (a shevus) it does not apply to the Temple.

⁵ I.e., they permitted the abrogation of the shevus in the Temple when it was shortly required, viz., for that same Shabbos, but not when it would only be required a week later.

⁶ Sc. the baking of the showbread. The Fast-day is Yom Kippur.

⁷ Why may it not be baked on the Festival? Tosfos: On my view, says Rabbah, there is no difficulty, as I maintain that this is precisely the point of the controversy: the first Tanna holds that the requirements of the Shabbos may not be prepared on a Festival, while Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel holds that they may be prepared. But on your view that the first Tanna too holds that the requirements of the Shabbos may be prepared on a Festival, but that here it is forbidden as a distant shevus, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel should merely state that even a distant shevus is permitted.

⁸ And that is what Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel really means.

Rav Mari raised an objection: The two loaves⁹ are eaten neither less than two [days after baking] nor more than three [days after baking].¹⁰ How so? They were baked on the eve of the Festival [and] eaten on the Festival, [i.e.,] on the second [day]. If the Festival fell after the Shabbos,¹¹ they are eaten on the Festival, on the third [day], because it [the baking] does not override either the Shabbos or the Festival.¹² But if you say [that] the requirements of the Shabbos may be prepared on the Festival, seeing that [those] of the Shabbos are permitted on the Festival, is there a question about [those] of the Festival on the Festival! There it is different, because Scripture said: [Save that which every man must eat, that only may be done] for you: ‘for you’, but not for the Most High.¹³ Then according to Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel who said on the authority of Rabbi Shimon the son of the Segan: It overrides the Festival, what is there to be said? — He holds as Abba Shaul, who interpreted: ‘for you’, but not for gentiles. [Summary: Rav Chisda maintains that the needs of Shabbos can be prepared on Yom Tov, yet one cannot bake the *shteï halechem* on Shavuos, because it is said: *however, that which is eaten by any person, that alone may be performed for you*. The words *for you* mean that you can prepare food on Yom Tov for yourself, but not for the purpose of a sacrificial offering. Thus, although the *shteï halechem* were eaten by the kohanim, their main purpose was for an offering. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, however, who maintains that one can bake the *shteï halechem* on Shavuos, interprets the verse like Abba Shaul, who says that when it said *for you*, this means that you can prepare for yourself and not for gentiles. This excludes preparing for gentiles but does not exclude preparing food for the service in the Bais HaMikdash, so it

would be permitted to bake the *shteï halechem* on Yom Tov.] (47a2 – 47a3)

Rav Chisda sent to Rabbah by the hand of Rav Acha son of Rav Huna: But do we say ‘since’? Surely we learned: One may plow one furrow, and be culpable for it on account of eight negative injunctions. The case is when he plows with an ox and a donkey yoked together (where he violates the biblical prohibition of “you shall not plow with an ox and donkey together”). The case refers to animals that are consecrated. [i.e. the ox has been consecrated as an offering and the donkey was donated to the treasury of the Bais HaMikdash. It is said: you shall not work with the firstborn of your ox, which is an ox that is brought on the mizbeich, and subsequently one cannot work with any animal that is used for an offering. One also cannot derive benefit from anything that is hekdesch, so by plowing with the consecrated ox and donkey he violates an additional two prohibitions.] Furthermore, it is said: do not sow your vineyard with mixed species, and this prohibits one from planting wheat kernels, barley kernels, and grape seeds together. By plowing the animals, he (covers the seeds lying on the ground, and) violates the prohibition of planting the seeds together. The fifth violation is if the plowing occurs during the Shemittah year, the seventh year when one must allow his land to lie fallow. The sixth violation occurs if he plows on Yom Tov, when it is forbidden to plow (as he is certainly not plowing to prepare food for that day). He also violates a seventh and eighth prohibition if he is a Kohen and a nazir in a cemetery (because by plowing in a cemetery, he becomes tamei to the corpses buried there). Now if we say ‘since’, let him not be liable for plowing [on the Festival], since it

⁹ *Shteï halechem* - Two loaves of bread were offered as a communal offering on the festival of Shavuos. These loaves were waved together with two communal *shelamim* offerings and they were then eaten by the Kohanim after the blood service of the *shelamim* offerings was finished.

¹⁰ The figures are inclusive of the day on which they were baked.

¹¹ I.e., on Sunday, so that they would be baked on the previous Friday.

¹² Hence they could not be baked on the Festival itself and eaten on the same day.

¹³ The two loaves, as well as the showbread, are sacred, and regarded as being ‘for the Most High’.

is fit for covering the blood of a bird?¹⁴ — Said Rav Pappa bar Shmuel: The reference is to smooth, round stones.¹⁵ [But] they are fit for crushing? — Is then crushing permitted on the Festival? But they are fit for crushing in an unusual manner?¹⁶ — The reference is to rocky ground.¹⁷ Is then rocky ground capable of being plowed? — It is rocky ground above, but powdered [loose] earth beneath.¹⁸ Then deduce it [that he is not culpable] because of the loose earth? But said Mar the son of Rav Ashi: The reference is to mud. And is mud capable of being plowed? — It refers to wet mud.¹⁹ (47a3 – 47b1)

Abaye raised an objection against him: He who cooks the gid hanasheh on a Festival and eats it incurs five sets of lashes. He incurs lashes on account of cooking the gid hanasheh on a Festival;²⁰ he incurs lashes on account of eating the gid hanasheh; he incurs lashes for cooking meat in milk; he incurs lashes for eating meat [cooked] in milk;²¹

¹⁴ When a bird is slaughtered its blood must be covered. This plowing crushes the earth and makes it fit for that purpose, and since a bird might be slaughtered on the Festival, that too would be necessary.

¹⁵ Which one cannot use to cover blood.

¹⁶ the stones can be crushed in an unusual manger on Yom Tov, thus the act will not be subject to the melachah of *tochen*, grinding, and the stones can be used to cover the blood of a slaughtered animal or bird.

¹⁷ Which one cannot crush into fine pieces and use the pieces to cover the blood.

¹⁸ With which blood may not be covered.

¹⁹ Which is fit for plowing, yet cannot be crushed into dust for covering blood.

²⁰ Which is a forbidden labor, since it is not the preparation of food which may be eaten.

²¹ These are two separate offences.

²² Which is likewise prohibited on a Festival, except when required for cooking permitted food.

²³ I.e., it was the gid hanasheh of a neveilah, and he incurs lashes for eating neveilah.

²⁴ Rabbi Chiya taught the above mentioned ruling as follows: One who cooks a *gid hanasheh* in milk on Yom Tov and then eats it receives five sets of lashes, and two sets are for eating. One set of lashes is for eating a *gid hanasheh*, and one set of lashes is for eating milk and meat that were cooked together, and three sets of lashes for cooking it. One is for lighting a fire on Yom Tov, another prohibition is for cooking on Tom Tov, and a third set is for coking

and he incurs lashes on account of lighting [a fire].²² But if we say, 'since', let him not be liable on account of lighting, since it is fit for him for his [legitimate] needs? — Said he to him, Omit lighting and substitute the gid hanasheh of a neveilah.²³ But Rabbi Chiya taught: He incurs lashes twice for his eating and thrice for his cooking; now if this is correct, he should say, thrice for his eating?²⁴ — Rather, omit lighting and substitute the wood of muktzeh.²⁵ And is muktzeh a Scriptural [prohibition]? — Yes, he replied, for it is written: And it shall come to pass on the sixth day that they shall prepare that which they bring in;²⁶ and its 'warning' [prohibition] is [learnt] from here, [viz.,] from, you shall not do any manner of work.²⁷ Said he to him, But it was you who said: I asked of Rav Chisda, — others state, I asked of Rav Huna: What if he brought a sheep from the pasture²⁸ and slaughtered it as a tamid-offering on a Festival?²⁹ And you said to us: He answered me, [It is written], *And a lamb*, [implying], but not a bechor;³⁰ *one*,

meat in milk. If the case referred to *gid hanasheh of neveilah*, Rabbi Chiya should have said that one receives three sets of lashes for eating it, one for eating *gid hanasheh*, another for eating meat and milk that were cooked together, and a third violation of eating *neveilah*.

²⁵ This may not be handled on Festivals. — He incurs lashes not for lighting but for putting it to use.

²⁶ This teaches that only what is 'prepared', as opposed to muktzeh, may be handled on Shabbos and Festivals.

²⁷ Lashes is administered only for the violation of a negative prohibition, not an affirmative mitzvah. The first verse quoted belongs to the latter category, hence the second verse must be added. Thus, since the use of muktzeh is forbidden by the first verse, making a fire with it is all ordinary labor forbidden by the second. — Though the second verse refers to the Shabbos, whereas we are here treating of the Festival, these two are alike in respect to work, save that the preparation of food is permitted on Festivals, but not on the Shabbos. Once however it is shown that a particular action is forbidden, it does not matter whether it is the Shabbos or a Festival.

²⁸ Outside the town. Animals that graze there are brought home (i.e., into town) only at intervals, not every evening, and therefore they are muktzeh, and may not be slaughtered on Festivals unless designated for that purpose on the eve of the Festivals.

²⁹ May it be offered?

³⁰ A 'lamb' implies both male and female, whereas a bechor applies only to males.

but not the ma'aser;³¹ of the flock, this is to exclude a palgas;³² out of the two hundred,[i.e.,] out of the residue of the two hundred which was left in the vat, from where we learn that orlah is nullified in [an excess of] two hundred;³³ from beverage [feast] of Israel, from that which is permitted to Israel. Hence it was said, One may not bring drink-offerings [nesachim] from tevel. You might think, he must not bring [them] from muktzeh [either], then say: Just as tevel is distinguished in that its intrinsic prohibition causes it, so everything whose intrinsic prohibition causes it [may not be used], thus muktzeh is excluded, because not its intrinsic prohibition causes it, but a prohibition of something else causes it.³⁴ Now if you say that the prohibition of muktzeh is Scriptural, what does it matter whether it is an intrinsic prohibition or a prohibition through something else? Moreover, it was you who said, There is separation of labors on the Shabbos,³⁵ but there is not separation of labors on a Festival!³⁶ — Rather, delete lighting and substitute the wood of the asheirah, while its 'warning' [prohibition] is [learnt] from here, [viz.,] And nothing shall cleave to your hand from the banned thing. Rav Acha son of Rava said to Abaye, Then let him incur lashes on account of, And you shall not bring an abomination into your house too? — Rather, delete lighting and substitute the wood of hekdesch, while the 'warning' is [learnt] from here, [viz.,] and you shall burn their asheirah trees with fire . . . you shall not do the same to Hashem your God. (47b2 – 48a2)

DAILY MASHAL

³¹ I.e., the tithe of animals cannot be dedicated for a tamid-offering. 'One' implies that it stands by itself, whereas the tithe is one out of ten.

³² A sheep beyond the age of a lamb and below that of a ram —i.e., a sheep in its thirteenth month.

³³ 'Out of the two hundred' is unintelligible in itself. Hence the Gemara assumes that it refers to the wine of the libation which accompanied the tamid-offering, and the meaning is this: if one part of forbidden wine, sc. wine of orlah, as much as is required for the libation, becomes mixed with two hundred times as much permitted wine, so that when the required quantity is removed from the wine-vat there still remains two hundred times as much,

THE GREATNESS OF THE RABBIS

The Gemara discusses the concept of a *shevus*, a rabbinical injunction, which is suspended for the service that was performed in the Bais HaMikdash.

One must wonder why rabbinical injunctions were suspended in the Bais HaMikdash. The Bais HaMikdash was the source of wisdom and the place where the Sanhedrin, the High Court, presided over judicial matters. Would it not be appropriate that the Chachamim enforced their injunctions in a place where rabbinical intellect was the overriding factor in all Halachic rulings?

Perhaps this idea itself reveals the greatness of our Sages of blessed memory. The Gemara in Yoma states that the prophets removed the words *haGibor veHaNora*, the Mighty One and the Awesome One from the prayers, because of their claim that "gentiles are croaking in the Sanctuary, where is His Might and Awesomeness?" Yet, the members of the Great Assembly reinstated these words, with the response that, "this itself is His Might and Awesomeness, that He allows the gentiles to blasphemies and yet He keeps silent." Similarly, the Chachamim enacted injunctions, yet, in the Holy Sanctuary, they humbled themselves before the sanctity of the service and they relaxed their rulings to allow the service to be performed properly.

then it may be used, the orlah having been nullified by the excess. — This is actually deduced from elsewhere (in Sifri), and this verse is merely quoted as support.

³⁴ I.e., it is not forbidden, in itself, save that its owner has voluntarily put it out of use for the time being.

³⁵ If a man performed two labors on the Shabbos in one state of unawareness, or one labor twice, each time having been unaware of the Shabbos (though he was reminded in the interval), he is liable on account of each separately.

³⁶ Yet here, where we treat of a Festival, you rule that he is separately culpable for muktzeh and for boiling the gid hanasheh.