



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

***Attachment of the
Lambs and the Loaves***

Rabbi Yochanan said: Everyone agrees that if the *shteihalechem* (the two loaves) and the lambs became attached to each other, they are essential to each other. The slaughtering of the lambs causes this attachment (and if the lambs or loaves become lost, the others must be destroyed).

Ulla said: In the West (*Eretz Yisroel*) they inquired: Does the waving (of the lambs together with the loaves before the slaughtering) create an attachment, or not?

The *Gemora* asks: Can this not be resolved from that which Rabbi Yochanan stated that the slaughtering of the lambs causes an attachment? Is it not evident that the waving does not accomplish this?

The *Gemora* answers: They were inquiring about Rabbi Yochanan’s statement. Did Rabbi Yochanan resolve that slaughtering of the lambs causes this attachment but waving does not, or perhaps he was certain that slaughtering of the lambs causes this attachment but he was unsure if the waving can accomplish this as well?

The *Gemora* leaves this question unresolved.

Rav Yehudah bar Chanina said to Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua: How can it be said that the waving attaches the lambs to the loaves? Isn’t the verse “they shall be holy to

Hashem for the Kohen” written regarding a point in time after the waving, and nevertheless, Ben Nannas and Rabbi Akiva disagree (whether this verse teaches us that the lambs can be brought without the loaves, or whether the loaves can be brought without the lambs)!?

The *Gemora* answers: But according to your opinion as well (this verse can be used as a challenge), for is the verse written regarding the point in time after the waving and not after the slaughtering? [No, it is not! It is referring to the point in time after the slaughtering!]? You are therefore compelled to say that the verse refers to the time before the slaughtering, and when it says, “they shall be holy to Hashem for the Kohen,” is to be understood that this is something that will eventually be distributed to the *Kohen* (after the slaughtering); then here as well, we can explain that it means that this is something that will eventually be distributed to the *Kohen* (after the waving).

The *Gemora* asks: And does the slaughtering create an attachment? But the following *braisa* (concerning a *korban todah* – a sacrifice offered as thanksgiving for having been saved from some danger) contradicts it, for it was taught: If its bread (one of its forty loaves) broke before the *todah* offering had been slaughtered, he should bring another bread and then the offering may be slaughtered. If the bread broke after the *todah* offering had been slaughtered, the blood should be sprinkled (as a *shelamim*) and the meat may be eaten, but he has not fulfilled his obligation and the bread is invalid. If the blood

had already been sprinkled (*and then the bread broke; he has fulfilled his obligation*), he must give to the *Kohen* a whole bread in place of the broken one. [A *todah* offering consists of forty breads – ten breads of four different types. One loaf from each ten is given to the *Kohen*. It cannot be a broken one.] Similarly, if a bread had been taken outside before the *todah* offering had been slaughtered, it should be brought back inside and then the offering may be slaughtered. If the bread had been taken outside after the *todah* offering had been slaughtered, the blood should be sprinkled (*as a shelamim*) and the meat may be eaten, but he has not fulfilled his obligation and the bread is invalid. If the blood had already been sprinkled (*and then the bread broke; he has fulfilled his obligation*), he must give to the *Kohen* a bread that is inside in place of that which had been taken outside. If a bread had become *tamei* before the *todah* offering had been slaughtered, he should bring another bread and then the offering may be slaughtered. If the bread had become *tamei* after the *todah* offering had been slaughtered, the blood should be sprinkled (*as a todah*) and the meat may be eaten, and he has also fulfilled his obligation, for the *tzitz* (*the head-plate worn by the Kohen Gadol*) renders acceptable the bread which became *tamei*; but the bread is invalid. If the blood had already been sprinkled (*and then the bread became tamei*), he must give to the *Kohen* a bread that is *tahor* in place of that which had become *tamei*.

Now, the *Gemora* concludes its challenge, if one were to hold that the slaughtering creates an attachment (*between the animal offering and the breads*), then surely when this attachment has already been created by the slaughtering and when afterwards, the breads become invalid (*by becoming tamei or leaving the city*), the *todah* offering should also be invalid!?

The *Gemora* answers: The *todah* offering is different, for the Torah refers to it as a *shelamim* (*besides being a*

todah); and just as a *shelamim* is offered without any bread, so too the *todah* offering too may be offered without bread. [This would not be the same as the lambs offered on *Shavuos*; they are only referred to as a *shelamim*, and once they are linked with the breads through *shechitah*, they cannot be offered without the breads.] (45b – 46a)

Waving or Slaughtering?

Rabbi Yirmiyah said: If you would say that the waving creates an attachment, then if the bread was lost (*after the waving*), the lambs must be destroyed, and if the lambs were lost, the breads must be destroyed. But if you will say that the waving does not create an attachment, then if he brought the bread and the lambs and he waved them, and then the bread was lost and he brought another bread, does that bread require waving or not?

Rabbi Yirmiyah notes: If the lambs were lost, there is no question that (*after being replaced*) they would require waving (*for they are the permitters for the breads, and the verse mandating waving is written by them*); the inquiry is only where the bread became lost.

Rabbi Yirmiyah notes further: According to Ben Nannas, who maintains that the lambs are regarded as the primary part of the offering (*and therefore he holds that the lambs can be brought without the breads, but the breads cannot be brought without the lambs*), this inquiry cannot arise (*and the new loaves will not require waving*). But it can only arise according to Rabbi Akiva, who maintains that the bread is regarded as the primary part of the offering. What would be the law? Shall we say that since the bread is regarded as the primary part of the offering, it needs to be waved; or perhaps, since it is the lambs which render the bread permissible, it does not need to be waved?

The *Gemora* leaves this question unresolved.



Abaye said to Rava: Why is it that the two lambs (*offered on Shavuos*) sanctify the bread and they are essential to it (*in their absence, the breads are invalid*), whereas the seven lambs and the bull and the rams (*also offered on Shavuos*) do not sanctify the bread and they are not essential to it?

Rava replied: It is because they have become attached to each other by the waving.

The *Gemora* asks: But let us consider the *todah* offering, where they (*the animal offering and the breads*) are not attached to each other by any waving, and yet the *todah* (*when it is slaughtered*) sanctifies the breads and is essential to them!?

The *Gemora* answers: Let us indeed compare it with the *todah* offering: just as the *todah* offering is a type of *shelamim* (*and it sanctifies the bread and is essential to it*), so here too, it is the *shelamim* (*which sanctifies the bread and is essential to it*).

The *Gemora* asks: But how can we make this comparison? By the *todah* offering there are no other offerings with it, but here, since there are other offerings (*olos*) that come with it, let them all sanctify the bread!?

The *Gemora* answers: Let us compare this case with the ram of the *nazir*: although there are other offerings that come with it, it is only *shelamim* only and nothing else that sanctifies the bread, so it is in this case too.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which indicates that it is the *nazir's* ram that sanctifies the bread, and not the other offerings. (46a – 46b)

Bread Brought Alone

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: If the two loaves were brought alone (*according to Rabbi Akiva, who maintains that they*

may be brought without the lambs), they must be waved, and then their appearance must be changed (*by leavening them overnight – thus invalidating them*), and they must be taken away to the place of burning (*where they are burned*).

The *Gemora* asks: But it is difficult either way you think about it: if they are permitted to be eaten then let them be eaten, and if they are (*forbidden to be eaten and only*) brought to be burned then let them be burned immediately!? Why is it necessary for their appearance to be changed?

Rabbah answered: Actually they are permitted to be eaten (*for the lambs are not essential to them*), but they are forbidden to be eaten as a precautionary measure lest in the following year, when lambs will be available, they might say, “Last year, did we not eat the loaves without offering the lambs? We can do the same this year!” They will not realize the fact that last year the loaves permitted themselves because there were no lambs, but now that there are lambs it is the lambs that render them permissible. [*This way, the Kohanim will not eat from the two loaves before they become permitted.*]

Rabbah said: How do I know this? It is from the following *Mishna*: Rabbi Yehudah said: Ben Buchri testified at Yavneh that a *Kohen* who donated a *shekel* has not committed a sin. [*Evidently, he is not obligated to donate the half-shekel. The Gemora in Shekalim derives this from a verse, which indicates that only those who were counted by Moshe in the general census have this obligation; this excludes the Kohanim who were counted by themselves.*] Rabbah Yochanan ben Zakkai said to him: Not so, but rather a *Kohen* who did not donate the *shekel* has committed a sin. The *Kohanim*, however, used to expound the following verse to their advantage: *And every minchah offering of a Kohen shall be completely burned; it shall not*

be eaten. [Now, if they would donate as well, a communal *minchah* would be partly theirs, and therefore, it would need to be completely burned.] Now, since the *omer* offering and the two loaves and the *lechem hapanim* are ours, how can they be eaten? [They therefore did not donate.]

Rabbah explains his proof: Now, what case is the *Mishna* referring to with regard to the two loaves? If they are brought with the sacrifice, then we can ask: Do not the *Kohanim* donate a *todah* offering and its breads and they nevertheless eat them? [So, why would they think that they cannot eat the two loaves brought together with the lambs?] It must be that they were offered by themselves, yet it states: How can they be eaten? Evidently, when the loaves are brought alone they are permitted to be eaten.

Abaye said to him: In truth it is referring to a case when they are brought with the sacrifice, and as to your challenge from the *todah* offering and its loaves, it is no difficulty at all, for the loaves of the *todah* offering are not referred to as a *minchah*, whereas the two loaves are referred to as a *minchah*.

Rav Yosef answers: The loaves are brought to be burned, but the reason why we do not burn them immediately is because we are not allowed to burn sacred things on a Festival.

Abaye asked him: What is the comparison? There (by offerings that became disqualified), they are not from the outset meant to be burned, but here since it is the proper procedure for them to be burned, they should be burned even on the Festival! This would be similar to the case with the bull and the goat offered on *Yom Kippur* (which is burned, for it is the correct procedure).

Rather, Rav Yosef said that we do not burn it immediately, for we are concerned that later on that day they might obtain lambs.

Abaye asked him: But as soon as the time comes that they cannot be offered any longer (after the offering of the afternoon *tamid*), they should be burned!?

The *Gemora* answers: That is actually what the *Mishna* meant.

Rava answers: I maintain that they are permitted to be eaten, and yet they are not eaten because of the precautionary measure stated by Rabbah (regarding the next year), but my source is from the following Scriptural verse: *From your dwelling places you shall bring bread of waving... the first produce to Hashem*. Just as the first produce are offered by themselves, so the two loaves may also be offered by themselves; and it follows as well that just as the first produce are permitted to be eaten, so too the two loaves are permitted to be eaten. (46b)