



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

Rav Assi said: Dough of ma’aser sheini, according to Rabbi Meir,¹ is exempt from challah; according to the Rabbis,² it is liable to challah. [As to] matzos of ma’aser sheini, according to Rabbi Meir, a man cannot discharge his obligation with it on Pesach; according to the Sages, a man can discharge his obligation with it on Pesach. [With regard to] an esrog of ma’aser sheini, according to Rabbi Meir he cannot discharge his obligation with it on Sukkos; according to the Sages, a man can discharge his obligation with it on Sukkos.

Rav Pappa demurred: as for dough, it is well, because it is written, of the first of your dough, [implying] of your own.³ The esrog too [is likewise], for it is written, and you shall take unto yourselves, [implying] it shall be of your own. But as for matzos, is then ‘your matzos’ written?⁴ — Said Rava — others state, Rav Yeimar bar Shelamya: [The meaning of] ‘bread’ [here] is derived from ‘bread’ [elsewhere]. Here It is written, the bread of affliction, while there it is written, then it shall be, that when you eat of the bread of the land [you shall offer up terumah to Hashem. Of the first of your dough etc.]: just as there [it means] of your own, so here too [it must be] of your own. Shall we say that [the following] supports him: Dough of ma’aser sheini is exempt from challah; this is the view of Rabbi Meir; but the Sages maintain, it is liable? [You

say], ‘Shall we say that this supports him’: this is the identical statement! — This is what he says: Shall we say that since they differ in the case of dough, they differ in respect to those too;⁵ or perhaps it is different there, because ‘your dough’ ‘your dough’ is written twice?⁶ (37b3 – 38a1)

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish asked: Can a man discharge his obligation⁷ with the challah of ma’aser sheini in Yerushalayim? On the view of Rabbi Yosi HaGellili there is no problem; seeing that he does not fulfill his obligation with chullin,⁸ can there be a question about its challah? Your question arises on the view of Rabbi Akiva: is it only with chullin that he can discharge his obligation, because if it is tamei it is permitted in [all] ‘habitations’,⁹ but with challah, which if tamei, is not permitted in [all] the ‘habitations’ and is consigned to the fire,¹⁰ he cannot discharge his obligation: or perhaps we say, since if he had not designated it with the name [of challah] and it became tamei, it would be permitted in [all] the ‘habitations’, and he could discharge [his obligation with it], then now too he can discharge [his obligation with it]?¹¹ Others state, this is certainly no question. for we certainly say ‘since’.¹² Your question arises in respect of challah which was bought with the money of

¹ Who holds that ma’aser sheini is sacred, not secular property, but that the Almighty favored the Israelite by permitting him to eat it himself.

² Who hold that it is secular property.

³ And whereas according to Rabbi Meir ma’aser sheini is not ‘your own’.

⁴ Surely not! Therefore, even if ma’aser sheini is not ‘yours’ according to Rabbi Meir, the law is still complied with by eating ma’aser sheini, matzos.

⁵ Sc. the esrog and matzos.

⁶ Which lays particular emphasis on ‘your’, as explained above.

⁷ Relating to the eating of matzos.

⁸ I.e., with ordinary ma’aser sheini after the challah has been separated.

⁹ This is a technical term denoting all places outside Yerushalayim. I.e., when tamei it can be redeemed even after it has entered Yerushalayim and then eaten anywhere. The fact that it might be eaten anywhere strengthens the reason for assuming that one can discharge his obligation with it.

¹⁰ Challah is like terumah. Now when the challah of ma’aser sheini is tahor it must be eaten in Yerushalayim, like all ma’aser sheini, while if it is tamei it may not be eaten at all, like all terumah which is tamei. Thus it can never be eaten beyond Yerushalayim.

¹¹ For the mere fact that it is challah is no drawback, as stated in a previous Mishnah, while its being ma’aser sheini is not a drawback either, on Rabbi Akiva’s view. Why then should it be unfit if it is challah of ma’aser sheini?

¹² I.e., this last argument is certainly valid.

ma'aser sheini.¹³ Now, on the view of the Rabbis there is no question, for since they say that it¹⁴ is to be redeemed, it is [identical with] the ma'aser [itself]. Your question arises on the view of Rabbi Yehudah who said, It must be buried. For we learned: If that which was bought with ma'aser sheini money was tamei, it must be redeemed: Rabbi Yehudah said, It must be buried.¹⁵ Do we say, since if it were not purchased, and since if he had not designated it with the name [of ma'aser sheini] and it became tamei, it would be permitted in [all] 'habitations', and he could discharge his duty with it, he can [therefore] discharge his duty with it now too,¹⁶ or perhaps we say one 'since',¹⁷ but we do not say 'since twice'¹⁸ — said Rava: It is logical that the name of ma'aser is one.¹⁹ (38a2 – 38a3)

The unleavened loaves of the todah offering and the wafers of a nazir, etc. From where do we know it? — Said Rabbah, Because Scripture said: And you shall guard the matzos: [it must be] matzos which are guarded for the sake of [the mitzvah of eating] matzos, thus excluding this, which is guarded not for the sake of matzos but for the sake of a sacrifice. Rav Yosef said, Scripture said: seven days shall you eat matzos: [that implies] matzos which may be eaten seven days; thus excluding this, which is not eaten seven days but [only] a day and a night. It was taught in accordance with Rabbah; it was taught in accordance with Rav Yosef. It was taught in accordance with Rabbah: You might think that he can discharge his obligation with the loaves of the todah offering and the wafers of a nazir, therefore it is stated, 'And

you shall guard the matzos', teaching [that it must be] matzos which is guarded for the sake of [fulfilling the obligation of eating] matzos, thus excluding this which is guarded not for the sake of matzos but for the sake of a sacrifice. It was taught in accordance with Rav Yosef: You might think that a man can discharge his obligation with the loaves of the todah offering and the wafers of a nazir; therefore it is said, 'seven days you shall eat matzos', implying, matzos which may be eaten seven days; thus excluding this, which may not be eaten seven days but [only] a day and a night. (38a3 – 38b1)

Yet deduce it from [the fact that it is designated], 'the bread of affliction', teaching, [it must be] that which may be eaten in grief, thus excluding this, which is not eaten in grief but [only] in joy? — He holds as Rabbi Akiva, who said, 'ani' is written. Then let him deduce it [from the fact] that it is rich matzos?²⁰ Said Rav Shmuel bar Rav Yitzchak: There is [only] a revi'is [of oil], and it is divided among many loaves.²¹ Yet deduce it [from the fact] that they might not be eaten in all habitations? — Said Rish Lakish: This proves that the loaves of the todah offering and the wafers of the nazir could be eaten in Nov and Giveon.²² (38b1 – 38b2)

It was taught: Rabbi Il'ai said: I asked Rabbi Elozar, How about a man discharging his obligation with the loaves of the todah offering and the wafers of a nazir? I have not heard, replied he. [So] I went and asked it before Rabbi Yehoshua. Said he to me, Surely they [the Sages] said: [As to] the [unleavened] loaves of the todah offering and the wafers of a nazir, if he

¹³ I.e., ma'aser sheini was redeemed, flour was bought with the money, and now challah was separated from the dough.

¹⁴ I.e., that which was purchased with ma'aser sheini money and which in turn became tamei.

¹⁵ Its sanctity is too slight to permit of redemption. while it may not be eaten on account of its tumah.

¹⁶ I.e., the food that is purchased with ma'aser sheini money cannot be more stringently regarded than ma'aser sheini itself. For the fact that it cannot be redeemed is not due to its greater sanctity but on the contrary because its sanctity is too slight to be capable of transference.

¹⁷ I.e., in the case of challah set aside from the ma'aser sheini.

¹⁸ I.e., in the case of challah set aside from that which has been purchased with ma'aser sheini money.

¹⁹ Whether it is actual ma'aser or bought with ma'aser money. Hence they are alike, and therefore he can fulfill his obligations with the challah set aside from either.

²⁰ Since he follows the written text, ani, viz., poverty; for the unleavened cakes brought with a sacrifice were kneaded with oil, which makes them 'rich' bread.

²¹ Only a quarter log of oil was used in the kneading of twenty large loaves: this would not make it rich matzah.

²² Before the building of the Temple, it was permitted to offer sacrifices on 'bamos' - altars that were erected at Nov and Giveon, amongst other places. Rish Lakish observes that since we do not deduce the present law from the fact that these loaves might not be eaten in all 'habitations', it follows that there was a time when they were eaten without Yerushalayim, viz., during the period of the bamos at Nov and Giveon. There is an opposing view, that of Rabbi Shimon, that the todah offering and the sacrifices of a nazir could not be offered on bamos.

made them for himself, he cannot discharge his obligation with them; if to sell in the market, he can discharge his obligation with them. When I went and discussed the matter before Rabbi Elozar, he said to me, By the covenant! These are the very words which were stated to Moshe at Sinai. Others state: By the covenant! Are these the very words which were stated to Moshe at Sinai? And isn't a reason required?²³ And what is the reason? — Said Rabbah: Whatever is for market, he may change his mind [about it], and he says, 'If it is sold, it is sold; if it will not be sold, I will discharge my duty with it'. (38b2)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Rich Matzah

The Magen Avraham (471:5) deduces from our *Gemora* that if a person uses mostly fruit juice and some water as the liquids with which he makes his *matzah*, he does not fulfill the *mitzvah* of *matzah* in any way with this *matzah*. Being that our *Gemora's* question was that the *matzah* of the *korbanos* should be invalid because it is mixed with oil, and the answer was that it is only a small amount of oil, this implies that if it would be mostly oil the *matzos* could not be used at all. He later says that even if the oil is less than half of the total liquid, the *matzah* cannot be used for the *mitzvah*. The *matzah* can only have the proportion of oil that the loaves of the *todah* had. The Mishnah Berurah (471:10) similarly rules that even if the fruit juice is a minority, if it can be tasted in the *matzah* one cannot fulfill the *mitzvah* of *matzah* with it. [See the Sfas Emes on our *Gemora* who refutes the proof of the Magen Avraham.]

DAILY MASHAL

The Navi writes in Melachim I 3:3, "And Shlomo loved Hashem, walking in the statutes of David, his father; only he sacrificed and burnt incense in high places." Rashi explains that while Shlomo acted in a manner similar to David HaMelech, he deviated in one area from his father's practice: he delayed the construction of the Bais HaMikdash for four

years, during which he continued to offer his sacrifices in the "high places," a reference to the personal Bamos, altars, that each individual placed on top of his roof or in his yard.

Horav Shmuel Truvitz, zl, cites the Netziv, zl, in his commentary to Shir HaShirim, who writes that we would be wrong to suspect Shlomo of indolence concerning building the Bais HaMikdash. The reason that he took his time in building the Bais HaMikdash, is that as long as there was no Bais HaMikdash the people were free to use their personal Bamos, allowing for increased latitude of expression of one's love for, and gratitude to Hashem. The Bamah was available everywhere. Anyone could sacrifice in any place. This is, regrettably, where Shlomo erred. While individual service is wonderful and meaningful, it is not the optimum that Hashem desires. Hashem does not want individual service, in which each person does his "own thing." He wants all of Klal Yisrael in perfect harmony and in total unity to worship Him collectively from one Bais HaMikdash through the medium of one service. As Moshe Rabbeinu told Korach, "We have one G-d, one Aron HaKodesh, one Torah, one Mizbayach, and one Kohen Gadol."

Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum in Peninim concludes: Hashem is one, and unity among His subjects is the precise manner in which He demands that we serve Him. Everything in our lives focuses on bringing together the various parts into a single, consolidated unit. While there is strength in numbers, this strength reaches its apex when all of its parts act in perfect harmony together, as one. This does not demean individual expression. On the contrary, every individual's personal contribution is significant, as long as each is focused on the same goal. Horav Yaakov Kamenetzky, zl, notes that Hashem divided Klal Yisrael into individual degalim, banners, each relating the singular traits of its shevet, tribe. This was done, however, only after the Mishkan was erected and placed in the middle of their encampment. They first had to all be focused on one unified goal - then, they were free to express themselves individually.

²³ Do you claim a divine origin for them that you draw this distinction without stating its grounds?