

25 Kislev 5778  
Dec. 13, 2017



Shevuos Daf 15

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

**Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h**  
**Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

**Additional Sanctity**

The *Mishna* had stated: no additions may be made to Yerushalayim or to the Temple Courtyard except by the decision of a King, prophet, *Urim ve’tumim* and a *Sanhedrin* of seventy-one.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the source for this?

Rav Shimi bar Chiya answers: It is written: *According to all that I show you, the form of the Tabernacle, and the form of all its vessels, and so shall you do for future generations. [All future buildings must be done with the same procedure; Moshe was both a king and a prophet; Aaron wore the Urim ve’tumim; Moshe was part of the Sanhedrin of seventy-one.]*

Rava asked a question from a *braisa*. The *braisa* states: When Moshe made the vessels for the Tabernacle, they were sanctified by anointing them with anointing oil. From then on, however, whenever new vessels were made for the *Beis Hamikdash*, using them in the service of the *Beis Hamikdash* is what invested the vessels with sanctity. But why? Let us say that the verse “*so shall you make it*” applies to future generations in this respect as well?!

The *Gemora* answers: There it is different, for it is written: *And he anointed them and sanctified them*. Only they were sanctified by anointing, but not those of later generations.

The *Gemora* asks: But why not say as follows: Those could be sanctified only by anointing, whereas the vessels made

afterwards might be sanctified either by using them in the service of the *Beis Hamikdash* or by anointing?

Rav Pappa said: It is written: *The utensils with which they shall minister in the Sanctuary*. The Torah made them dependent on usage.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, why do we need the word “*osam*” –them?

The *Gemora* answers: If not for “*osam*,” I might have thought that the sanctification of the vessels of the future required both anointing and usage, the Torah therefore emphasized “*osam*” i.e., only they (*the original utensils*) need anointing, but not those of future generations. (14b – 15a)

**Loaves of the Todah**

The *Mishna* said: Two *todah* sacrifices are brought when extending Yerushalayim or to the Temple Courtyard.

The *braisa* states: The two *todos* that are said to be used in extending the city or Courtyard make the area holy only with the loaves of bread that are brought with them, not with the meat of the *korban*.

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know this?

Rav Chisda answers: The verse says: *And I placed two large todah offerings, and a procession to the right, next to the wall*. What does the verse mean by *large*? If it means from



a large type of animal, let it say bulls! Rather, it must mean they are large for an animal of their type. However, is the fact that they are large special to Hashem?! Doesn't the *Mishna* say: The verse says regarding an animal *olah*: a fire offering that gives a satisfying aroma, and it says regarding a bird *olah*: a fire offering that gives a satisfying aroma, and it says regarding a *minchah* (flour offering): a fire offering that gives a satisfying aroma. This teaches us that whether someone brings a large sacrifice or a small sacrifice, it is just as pleasing to Hashem. The important aspect of the sacrifice is that he directs his heart to his Father in Heaven.

Rather, it must mean the largest of breads brought with the *korban todah*. These were the *chametz* (leavened) breads. This is as the *Mishna* says that the *korban todah* would be brought from five measures of a Yerushalayim *se'ah*, which equals six Wilderness *se'ahs* (for the Sages enlarged the *se'ah* by a sixth; in the Wilderness three *se'ahs* equaled an *eifah*, and therefore six *se'ahs* equaled two *eifahs*; later, in Yerushalayim, the *se'ah* was enlarged, so that there were five *se'ahs* in two *eifahs*), which equals two *eifahs*, and one *eifah* equals three Wilderness *se'ahs*, which were twenty *issarons* (tenths of an *eifah*). Ten *issarons* were used for the *chametz* breads, and ten were used for the *matzah* breads. The *matzah* breads consisted of three varieties: *chalos* (unleavened breads which had olive oil added to the dough), *rekikin* (wafers – baked without oil, and oil was added afterwards), and *revuchah* (boiled and then baked). [They made ten loaves of each variety, so that there were thirty unleavened loaves made from the ten *issarons*; the leavened loaves were only of one type, so that the ten leavened loaves were equal to the thirty unleavened loaves; each leavened loaf was, therefore, three times the size of an unleavened loaf.] (15a)

### **Sanctifying the Courtyard**

Rami bar Chama says: The extension of the Courtyard only becomes holy through the leftover pieces of the flour

offering (not the breads of the *todah*). [They carried the remainder of the *minchah* – the portion that was eaten by the *Kohanim*, around the perimeter of the new area.] Why is this? It is like Yerushalayim. Just as Yerushalayim becomes sanctified through something that is eaten there, so too the Courtyard becomes sanctified through items that are eaten there.

The *Gemora* asks: But the loaves from the *todah* are also eaten in the Courtyard (why specifically the leftovers of the flour offering)?

Rather, the *Gemora* explains, he means it should be like Yerushalayim as follows: Just as the city becomes sanctified through something (the loaves of the *todah*) that must be eaten in Yerushalayim, and it is something that becomes invalid if it leaves Yerushalayim, so too the Courtyard must become sanctified through something (the remainder of the *minchah*) that must be eaten in it, and that become invalid if it leaves there. (Being that a flour offering must be eaten in the Courtyard, it can make the Courtyard holy.)

The *Gemora* asks: If Yerushalayim is sanctified through something that is *chametz*, the Courtyard should only become sanctified through something that is *chametz*!?

The *Gemora* answers: There is no such thing as a *chametz* flour offering!

And if you will say that you should make the leftovers of a flour offering into *chametz*, and then sanctify the Courtyard, this cannot be, as the verse says: Do not bake them as *chametz*, their share etc. Rish Lakish says: This means that even their share should not become *chametz*!

The *Gemora* asks: It is possible to sanctify the Courtyard with the two loaves brought on *Shavuot* that indeed are *chametz* (and are considered a flour offering)!?



The *Gemora* answers: This is not possible. How would this be done? We cannot build the extension to the Courtyard the day before (*Shavuos*) and sanctify it the day before, as the two breads only become holy when the lambs (*of Shevuos*) are slaughtered! We cannot build it the day before and sanctify it on *Shavuos*, as the sanctification should occur on the day that it is built! We cannot do both on *Yom Tov*, as the building of the Temple does not override *Yom Tov*! We cannot do both on the day after *Yom Tov*, as the two breads will be invalidated as they remained overnight! We cannot build most of it before *Yom Tov* and finish it right after *Yom Tov*, as the Temple cannot be built at night! This is as Abaye says: How do we know that one cannot build the Beis Hamikdash at night? The verse states: *And on the day that the Tabernacle was erected.* It may be erected during the day, but not at night. This is why it is not possible to extend the Courtyard with *chametz*.

The *Mishna* says it is extended with song.

The *braisa* states: The song accompanying the *todah* is with harps, lyres, and cymbals on every corner and big stone in Yerushalayim. The one singing sings, *I will lift (i.e. praise) You Hashem, for you have drawn me up* etc. Additionally, the psalm discussing warding off demons is said. Some say it discusses plagues. The latter opinion says this due to the verse: *And a plague should not come close to your tent.* The former opinion is due to the verse: *A thousand will fall from your side.* They sing the verses: *He who sits in the shade of the Most High, shall dwell in the shade of the Almighty,* until the verse: *For You are Hashem my shelter, You have made the Most High Your dwelling place.* And then they sing: *A psalm for David when he was running away from Avshalom his son. Hashem, how many are my tormentors!* until the verse: *For Hashem is the salvation; on Your nation is Your blessing, selah.*

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi would say these verses before he went to sleep.

The *Gemora* asks: How did he do this? Didn't Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi himself say that it is forbidden to heal oneself with words of Torah?

The *Gemora* answers: One may say words of Torah to protect himself (*not to heal oneself*).

The *Gemora* asks: It must be that when he said it is forbidden, it is when one is already wounded. In such a case, is it merely forbidden? Doesn't the *Mishna* say that one who whispers verses to heal a wound has no portion in the World to Come?

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Yochanan already explained that verse as meaning that one who spits and then says these verses has no portion in the World to Come, as one cannot say the name of Heaven when spitting.

The *Mishna* says that (*when extending*) *Beis Din* walks, and the two *todah* offerings are behind them.

The *Gemora* asks: Does this mean that *Beis Din* walks before the *todos*? Doesn't the verse say: *And Hoshaya and half the lords of Yehudah walked behind them (todos)*?

The *Gemora* answers: This is what the *Mishna* means. *Beis Din* goes along with the *Kohanim* who are carrying the *todos*, and *Beis Din* goes after them. How do the *todos* go?

Rabbi Chiya and Rabbi Shimon the son of Rebbe argue. One says that the two loaves of the *todah* go beside each other. Another says that they are carried one behind the other. The former opinion holds that the "inner loaf" mentioned in the *Mishna* is the one closest to the wall. The latter opinion says that the "inner one" is the one closer to *Beis Din* (*although it was behind in the procession*).

The *Mishna* says: The inner one is eaten and the outer one is burned. This is understandable according to the opinion



that they go one after the other. The inner loaf may be eaten, because the outer loaf enters the area first and sanctifies it. [*The outer loaf, on the other hand, cannot be eaten because it becomes invalidated when it left the sanctified area; it therefore must be burned.*] However, according to the opinion that they were carried alongside each other, they sanctify the new area at the same time (*and therefore should have the same law – either both should be eaten, or both should be burned*)!?

The *Gemora* counters: According to this, the other opinion is also difficult! How can one loaf by itself sanctify the area without the other? Didn't the *Mishna* say: If any addition was made without all these requirements, one is not liable if one enters it? [*This implies that both loaves are necessary for the sanctification.*] And even according to the opinion (*cited below*) that any of these requirements are sufficient, the two loaves are considered one *mitzvah* (*and one of them will not effect sanctification*)!?

Rather, Rabbi Yochanan answers: It is by command of a prophet that one loaf is eaten and one loaf is burned. (15a – 16a)

## DAILY MASHAL

### ***Doors on the Third Beis Hamikdash***

Our *Gemora* states that the Beis Hamikdash cannot be built at night, or on *Yom Tov*.

Tosfos here and Rashi (*in several places in Shas*) cites a *Gemora* that the Beis Hamikdash could be built on *Shabbos*; isn't that a desecration of *Shabbos*? They answer that it is only regarding a Beis Hamikdash built by humans that there is a restriction of building it on *Shabbos*. The third Beis Hamikdash, however, will descend from Heaven miraculously, thus there are no restrictions regarding its building.

The Maharil Diskin is troubled by this answer, as the Jewish People have an obligation to build the Beis Hamikdash, so why would Hashem prevent us from performing this *mitzvah*?

He answers based on a Medrash in Eichah (2:9). It is written: "*Tavu b'Aretz She-areha...*" -- the gates of the Beis Hamikdash were hidden away, sunken into the ground, before the Beis Hamikdash itself was destroyed. When the Beis Hamikdash was destroyed, its gates sunk into the ground, and in the future, the Jewish People will excavate the gates and affix them to the Beis Hamikdash.

The *Gemora* in Bava Basra rules as follows: If a man builds a large mansion on the estate of a deceased convert (*with no heirs*) and another man comes and puts the doors on, the second person becomes owner. Why is this? It is because the first one merely arranged bricks there (*for without the doors, there is no use for the mansion more that there already was with the land itself; it is the installation of the doors that completes the building*).

Accordingly, we can say that we will fulfill the *mitzvah* of building the Beis Hamikdash when the Third Beis Hamikdash will descend from Heaven; it will be missing one thing. It will not have doors! The *mitzvah* will be fulfilled when we secure its gates.

This can also be the explanation of the words that we recite in the Shemoneh Esrei of Mussaf on the festivals: *Show us its rebuilding (v'har-eynu b'vinyono) and gladden us with its perfection (v'samchenu b'tikuno)*. "Show us its rebuilding" refers to the sending down of the virtually completed third Beis Hamikdash. We will then complete the Beis Hamikdash by attaching the doors and will be gladdened by its perfection and by the fact that we fulfilled the *mitzvah* of building it.