



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

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: How was the waving performed? The *Kohen* would place his hands under the hands of the owner and he would wave the parts. How was this done? He would place the sacrificial portions on the palm of his hand and the breast and thigh above them; and whenever there were breads (*to be waved*), the breads would be on top,

Rav Pappa said: At the Inauguration service, we find that the bread was placed on top.

The *Gemora* asks: Why is it so (*that the breast and thigh are placed on top of the sacrificial portions*)? It cannot be because it is written ‘*the thigh of the raising and the breast of the waving upon the fire-offering fats they shall bring to wave it for a wave-service*,’ for it is also written, ‘*he shall bring the fat upon the breast*.’

Abaye said: The latter verse refers to the manner in which the *Kohen* brings them from the butchering place. He first placed the fats on the other parts (*and he would then turn them over into the hands of the Kohen that was about to wave them*).

The *Gemora* asks: But it is also written: And they placed the fats upon the breasts?

The *Gemora* answers: This refers to the handing over of these (*after the waving*) to the *Kohen* that is about to burn them on the altar. These verses incidentally inform us that three *Kohanim* were required for this service, as it is written: *With the multitude of people is the king’s glory*.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: It is written (*regarding the two lambs of Shavuot*): *And the Kohen shall wave them upon the first offering breads*. I might think that he should place the lambs upon the bread; the Torah therefore states: *upon the two lambs*. If the Torah would have only written ‘*upon the two lambs*,’ I might have thought that he should place the bread upon the lambs, the Torah therefore states: *upon the first offering breads*. Now the verses are equally balanced and I do not know whether the bread shall be upon the lambs or the lambs upon the bread. Since, however, we find that in all places the bread is on top, then here too, the bread shall be on top.

Rav Pappa said: At the Inauguration service, we find that the bread was placed on top.

The *braisa* continues with a dissenting opinion: Rabbi Yosi ben Meshulam says: The lambs shall be on top. And regarding the verse ‘*upon the two lambs*,’ it is coming to exclude the seven lambs (*that they are not waved together with the breads*).

Chanina ben Chachinai says: He places the two breads between the thighs of the lambs and waves them. This fulfills both verses: it emerges that the bread is upon the lambs and the lambs are upon the bread.

Rebbe said: If before a king of flesh and blood one would not do such a thing, would they do so before the King of Kings, the Holy One, Blessed be He! Rather, he should place one beside the other and wave them.



The *Gemora* asks: But we need to conform with the requirement of 'al' (meaning that one must be placed on top of the other)!?

Rav Chisda said to Rav Hamnuna, and others say that it was Rav Hamnuna who said to Rav Chisda: Rebbe follows his own opinion that 'al' means 'near,' as it was taught in a *braisa*: It is written: *And you shall place pure frankincense "al" each stack (the twelve loaves of bread that were placed on the Table in the Sanctuary)*. Rebbe understands the word "al" to mean that it should be placed (on the Table) "near" the stacks. This can be proven from the verse: *And you shall screen "al" the Ark with the partition*. Here, obviously, the word "al" means "near" (for the partition was a vertical curtain, not a covering).

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: One extends them outward and brings them inward to demonstrate that Hashem owns all four directions of the world. One raises them upwards and lowers them to signify that the heavens and the earth belong to Hashem.

In *Eretz Yisroel*, they taught this as follows: Rav Chama bar Ukva said in the name of Rabbi Yosi bar Chanina: One extends them outward and brings them inward in order to keep off violent winds. One raises them upwards and lowers them in order to keep off harmful dews.

Rabbi Yosi bar Rav Avin says: This proves that even the remnants of a *mitzvah* may ward off punishment, for the *mitzvah* of waving is dispensable, and yet it keeps off violent winds and harmful dews.

Rabbah said: The same (the method of waving) applies to the *lulav*.

Rav Acha bar Yaakov would swing it outward and bring it inward, and hold it out and say, "An arrow in the eyes of Satan!" [He cannot prevent the Jewish people from

performing the *mitzvos*.] But it is not proper to do so, for it is inspiring Satan to provoke him to sin.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: The communal *shelamim* sacrifices require waving after they are slaughtered as well, and the waving must be performed as they are (the whole animal); these are the words of Rebbe. But the Sages say: Only the breast and thigh are waved.

Rav Chisda said to R. Hamnuna, and others said that it was Rav Hamnuna to Rav Chisda: They differ as to whether we say: Derive from it and everything from it; or, derive from it and place the deduction in its own place. The Rabbis hold the position that we should derive from it and everything from it: (derive from it:) just as an individual's *shelamim* offering require waving after it is slaughtered, so too the communal *shelamim* requires waving after being slaughtered; and everything from it: just as an individual's *shelamim* is waved with the breast and thigh, so here too it is waved with just the breast and thigh. And Rebbe holds: derive from it and place the deduction in its own place: just as an individual's *shelamim* offering require waving after it is slaughtered, so too the communal *shelamim* requires waving after being slaughtered; and place the deduction in its own place: it is by an individual *shelamim* that the waving is performed with the breast and thigh only, but here it is waved as they are, that is, as they are when they were alive (which means with the entire animal).

Rav Pappa said: All maintain that we derive from it and everything from it, but the following is Rebbe's reason: it (the communal *shelamim*) must be comparable to there (the individual's *shelamim*): and just as there all that which is given as a gift to the *Kohen* (the breast and the thigh) must be waved, so here too, all that which is given as a gift to the *Kohen* (all the animal's meat is eaten by the *Kohanim*) must be waved.

Ravina said: All maintain that we derive from it and place the deduction in its own place, but this is the reason of the



Rabbis: The expression ‘their *shelamim* offerings’ is an inclusive term (*which teaches us that the communal shelamim should be waved in the same manner in which the individual’s shelamim is waved*).

Rabbi Shimon said: Three types of sacrifices require the performance of three special *mitzvos* among them, while each individually only requires one of these *mitzvos*. They are the individual’s *shelamim*, communal *shelamim* (*kivsei atzeres*), and the *asham* of a *metzora*. An individual’s *shelamim* requires *semichah* (*the owner places his hands on the head of the sacrificial animal before it is slaughtered and leans on it with all his weight*) while the animal is alive, and waving after it is slaughtered, but it does not require waving when it is alive. A communal *shelamim* requires waving both while the animal is alive and after it is slaughtered, but it does not require *semichah*. The *asham* of a *metzora* requires *semichah* and waving while the animal is alive, but it does not require waving after the animal is slaughtered.

The *Gemora* asks: But could we not say that the individual’s *shelamim* offering should require waving while alive through the following *kal vachomer*: if the communal *shelamim*, which does not require *semichah* while alive, requires waving while alive, then the individual’s *shelamim*, which does require *semichah* while alive, should most certainly require waving while alive!

The *Gemora* answers: The Torah stated by the communal *shelamim*: *them*. This is in order to exclude the individual’s *shelamim*.

The *Gemora* asks: But could we not say that the communal *shelamim* offering should require *semichah* through the following *kal vachomer*: if the individual’s *shelamim*, which does not require waving while alive, requires *semichah*, then the communal *shelamim*, which requires waving while alive, should most certainly require *semichah*!

Ravina answered: There is a tradition that there are only two communal offerings which require *semichah* (*the communal error bull and the goat sent to Azazel on Yom Kippur*).

The *Gemora* asks: But could we not say that the *asham* of the *metzora* should require waving after it was slaughtered through the following *kal vachomer*: if the individual’s *shelamim*, which does not require waving while alive, requires waving after it was slaughtered, then the *asham* of the *metzora*, which requires waving while alive, should most certainly require waving after it was slaughtered!

The *Gemora* answers: The Torah stated by the individual’s *shelamim*: *it*. This is in order to exclude the *asham* of the *metzora*. (61b – 62b)

GLOSSARY

Hagashah – bringing the meal offering close to the altar
shtei halechem (*two loaves offered on Shavuos*)

Tenufah – waving

minchas nesachim (*minchah brought together with libations*)

Semichah – leaning on the animal with two hands

DAILY MASHAL

And Why Don’t We Mix in Honey?

Concerning preparing the incense we are told: If he would put in the slightest amount of honey, no one could withstand its smell. And why don’t we mix in honey? Because the Torah said, “All leavening and all honey, you shall not offer from it a fire-offering for Hashem” (*Sidur*). Why is the text so long? The Radbaz (IV, 1:110) explained that this text negates the opinion that honey is forbidden only when offered alone but not if a little of it is mixed in other offerings. Therefore they said, “Because the Torah said, “you shall not offer **from it**” even a little of it is forbidden. The Kotzker Rebbe commented: “And why don’t we mix in honey? Because the Torah said! Don’t disillusion yourself to seek a reason. It’s simply forbidden!”