



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

Lechem Hapanim during the Journeys

They inquired: Was the *lechem hapanim* (show bread) rendered invalid during the journeys in the Wilderness, or not? [*The bread remained on the Table while they travelled, but since the entire Tabernacle was dismantled, perhaps it should become invalid on account of “leaving” the Courtyard.*]

Rabbi Yochanan and Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi disagree: One said that it was rendered invalid, whereas the other one said that it was not rendered invalid.

The *Gemora* explains: One said that it was rendered invalid, because it is written: *As they encamp so shall they journey*. Just as when they encamped it was rendered invalid by leaving the Courtyard, so too when they journeyed it was rendered invalid by leaving (*since it was not inside the Courtyard*).

The other says that it was not rendered invalid, because it is written: *And the constant bread shall remain on it*.

The *Gemora* asks: What does this one do with the verse, ‘*As they encamp so shall they journey*’?

The *Gemora* answers: It teaches us the reverse: Just as when they encamped it was not rendered invalid if it had not been taken outside the Courtyard, so too when they journeyed it was not rendered invalid if it had not left its place.

The *Gemora* asks: What does the other one do with the verse, ‘*And the constant bread shall remain on it*’?

The *Gemora* revises the inquiry: When Rav Dimi came from *Eretz Yisroel*, he said as follows: If the bread was still arranged on the Table while they travelled, they do not dispute its validity; they differ only regarding the bread that had been removed (*before they began to travel*).

The *Gemora* explains: One said that it was rendered invalid, because it is written: *As they encamp so shall they journey*. Just as when they encamped it was rendered invalid by leaving the Courtyard, so too when they journeyed it was rendered invalid by leaving (*since it was not inside the Courtyard*).

The other says that it was not rendered invalid, because it is written: *And the Tent of meeting shall journey*. Even though they were journeying, it was still the Tent of Meeting.

The *Gemora* asks: What does this one do with the verse, ‘*As they encamp so shall they journey*’?

The *Gemora* answers: It teaches us the reverse: Just as when they encamped it was not rendered invalid if it had not been taken outside the Courtyard, so too when they journeyed it was not rendered invalid if it had not left its place.

The *Gemora* asks: What does the other one do with the verse, ‘*And the Tent of meeting shall journey*’?



The *Gemora* answers: That only comes to teach us the place of the Tabernacle among the tribal flags (*between the second and the third*).

The other one derives this from the following verse: *The camp of the Levites in the middle of the encampments.*

The *Gemora* asks from a *braisa*: During the dismantling of the Tabernacle on their journeys, sacrifices became unfit (*for consumption*) due to leaving, and *zavin* and *metzoraim* were sent out of the camps (*even though they were traveling, the camps remained intact, and a metzora had to leave all three camps, whereas a zav had to leave the Levites' Camp*).

Now this applies, does it not, also to the *lechem hapanim*?

The *Gemora* answers: No, it applies to everything except the *lechem hapanim*.

The *Gemora* asks: But either way it is difficult; for if you hold that it is still the Tent of Meeting, then the sacrificial offerings should also not become invalidated, and if you hold that it is no longer the Tent of Meeting, then even the *lechem hapanim* should become invalidated!?

Rather, it was reported by Ravin when he came from *Eretz Yisroel*: One stated his view in respect of the *lechem hapanim* that was still arranged on the Table (*that they are not invalidated*), whereas the other stated his view in respect of the *lechem hapanim* that had been removed (*and therefore, they are invalidated*), and so they do not disagree at all.

Abaye said: This proves that the Tabernacle could be dismantled for journeying at night (*if the cloud lifted - which was the signal for the camp to travel again - at night, the Tabernacle was immediately dismantled and they did not wait for morning*); for should you hold that the Tabernacle could not be dismantled for journeying at night – when were the curtains (*of the Courtyard*) taken down (*or carried away*)? It was only in the morning (*for Abaye is assuming that they started travelling in the beginning of the night, or the*

beginning of the day); then why did the sacrificial foods become invalid on account of leaving the Tabernacle? Surely they should become invalidated by being kept overnight!?

The *Gemora* asks: Is this (*that they began to travel at night*) not obvious? The Torah explicitly states: *to journey by day and by night!*

The *Gemora* answers: I might have thought that they journeyed by night only when the Tabernacle was uprooted by day, but if it was not uprooted by day, they would not set out at night; Abaye therefore teaches us that it was not so.

The *Gemora* asks a contradiction from the following *braisa*: As soon as the curtains of the Courtyard were rolled up, the *zavin* and *metzoraim* were permitted to enter into the camp! [*A braisa before was cited that that they were obligated to leave the camps!?*]

Rav Ashi answers: This is not a difficulty, for one *braisa* represents the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, and the other one reflects the opinion of the Rabbis, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Eliezer said: You might think that if those that were *zavin* or *metzoraim* had forced their way through and entered the Courtyard at a time when the *pesach* sacrifice was being offered in a state of (*corpse*) *tumah*, you might think that they are liable (*to kares, for the dispensation is only for corpse tumah*); the Torah therefore stated: *They shall send out of the camp every metzora, and any zav, and anyone who is tamei due to a corpse*. When those that are *tamei* by corpse *tumah* are sent out, *zavin* and *metzoraim* are sent out as well; when those that are *tamei* by corpse *tumah* are not sent out, those that are *zavin* and *metzoraim* are not sent out either. [*Similarly, with respect to those who were tamei during the time that the Tabernacle was dismantled; since those that were tamei with corpse tumah were not sent out at all, for they were only excluded from the Courtyard, and there was no Courtyard during the journeys, zavin and metzoraim are likewise not sent out of the camp.*] (95a – 95b)

Mishna

The *shteí halechem* and the *lechem hapanim* were similar in that their kneading and shaping were performed outside the Courtyard, but the baking was done inside; and it (*the baking*) did not override *Shabbos*. Rabbi Yehudah said: All of their procedures (*to prepare it*) were performed inside the Courtyard. Rabbi Shimon said: Accustom yourself to say that the *shteí halechem* and the *lechem hapanim* are valid, whether they were made in the Courtyard or in Beis Pagi (*a walled area outside the Courtyard*). (95b)

Baking of the Lechem Hapanim

The *Gemora* asks: Is the *Mishna* not difficult? It said that the kneading and the shaping were performed outside. This proves that the solid-measures were not sanctified, and then it said that the baking was done inside. This proves that the solid-measures were sanctified!?

Rava said: This question was hard to answer by a hard man, who is as hard as iron, and who is this? Rav Sheishes.

But what is the difficulty? Perhaps the *issaron* (*the measure used for the flour*) does not sanctify (*that which is placed inside of it*); whereas the oven does sanctify!

Rather, the *Gemora* notes, if a difficulty is to be pointed out, it is the following: The *Mishna* said that the baking was done inside, which proves that the oven sanctifies, and then it said that it did not override *Shabbos* (*which means that it must have been baked before Shabbos*)! The breads would then become invalidated on account of *linah* (*being left overnight after sanctification*)!?

Rava said: This question was hard to answer by a hard man, who is as hard as iron, and who is this? Rav Sheishes.

Rav Ashi said: But what is the difficulty? Perhaps when it said that it was baked inside, it meant that it should be baked

under the supervision of diligent men (*by Kohanim; and it should not be done by them in order that it should not become chametz*).

The *Gemora* notes: This answer of Rav Ashi, however, is a mistake; for whichever way you consider, it is difficult: If the baking required the supervision of diligent men, then the kneading and the shaping should also require the supervision of diligent men; and if the kneading and the shaping did not require the supervision of diligent men, then the baking also should not require the supervision of diligent men! We must therefore say that Rav Ashi's answer is indeed a mistake.

The *Mishna* had stated: Rabbi Yehudah said: All of their procedures (*to prepare it*) were performed inside the Courtyard. [Rabbi Shimon said: Accustom yourself to say that the *shteí halechem* and the *lechem hapanim* are valid, whether they were made in the Courtyard or in Beis Pagi (*a walled area outside the Courtyard*).

Rabbi Avahu bar Kahana said: Both of them derived their opinions from the same verse: *And it is in a manner of nonsacredness, though it were sanctified today in a vessel*. Rabbi Yehudah maintains that David found the *Kohanim* baking the *lechem hapanim* on a weekday and said to them, "You are baking it on a weekday! But since it has been sanctified today in the vessel, it will become invalid by being left overnight"!? Rabbi Shimon, however, maintains that he found them baking it on *Shabbos*, and said to them, "Should you not have baked it on a weekday? After all it is not the oven that sanctifies the bread (*that there should be a "linah" concern*) - but the Table"!?

The *Gemora* asks: But how can it be said that he found them while they were baking the bread? Is it not written: *And the Kohen gave him sacred bread; for there was no bread there but the showbread that was taken from before Hashem?*

Rather, this is what was meant by 'in a manner of nonsacredness': They said to him that there is no bread here

but the showbread that was taken from before Hashem. And he replied to them: As to that bread (*which has been removed*), there is no necessity at all (*to say that it is permitted*), for since it is no longer subject to the laws of *me'ilah*, it is regarded as a manner of nonsacredness; but even this bread, which has been sanctified today in the vessel, you may give me to eat, for it is a matter of mortal danger (*for David had been overcome by a sickness on account of his hunger, and in order to save his life, all laws may be superseded*).

The *Gemora* concludes that the argument between Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Shimon was regarding the oral tradition (*and they each had different versions*). (95b – 96a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Camps during Travelling

Rashi writes that although the sacrificial foods become invalidated on account of “leaving” – for while they are journeying, there is no *Machaneh Shechinah*, nevertheless, the sanctity of *Machaneh Leviyah* and *Yisroel* still remains, and that is why the *zavim* and *metzoraim* are sent out from there.

However, the *Gemora's* version in Zevachim is that the sacrificial foods become invalidated, but it does not state: on account of “leaving.” Rashi there explains that it cannot be invalidated on account of “leaving,” for it is evident from the braisa that even while they are travelling, it still remains the *Ohel Moed*, for otherwise, why were the *zavim* and *metzoraim* sent out from there? There is no longer any sanctity from the Camps!? The sacrificial foods, however, become invalidated on account that the altar has been removed.

Tosfos there challenges Rashi from our *Gemora* where it explicitly states that the sacrificial foods become invalidated on account of “leaving” – and we do not say that even while

they are travelling it still remains the *Ohel Moed*. Since it is no longer *Machaneh Shechinah*, the sacrificial foods are regarded as if they left their boundaries, and are there invalidated. The reason why *zavim* and *metzoraim* are sent out from there is because with respect of *Machaneh Leviyah* and *Yisroel*, the travelling does not remove their status of sanctity.

DAILY MASHAL

Still in Exile

A hundred years ago slavery was common in Tunisia. Hunters of people would go to the Negro regions and kidnap men and women to sell them like animals. One day Rabbi Shaul HaKohen, the Rabbi of Jerba, passed through the market and heard an announcement in the king's name: Anyone with a slave should set him free! Anyone who deals in the slave trade will be severely punished! “What happened?” he asked those around him.

“The enlightened nations have decided to abolish slavery. The spirit of freedom rules the world.”

When he heard this he began to weep till he dissolved in bitter tears.

“Does the Rabbi have slaves or maidservants?” they wondered.

He turned to them and said, “Who are these slaves? The descendents of Canaan, who was cursed with slavery. For thousands of years this curse has befallen them till Hashem enlightened the heart of kingdoms to set them free. Whereas we, the children of kings, have been subjected to degradation for 2,000 years and are still in this situation and why? „Who put Yaakov to plunder and Israel to spoilers?” – „Behold, Hashem, it is because we sinned to Him” (*Eish Das* in the name of *Nachalas Tzvi*, 43).