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

How do we know [that it (a bechor) must be sprinkled] over against the base? — Rabbi Eliezer said: The meaning of 'sprinkling' is learned from an olah. And how do we know it of an olah itself? — Because it is written: At the base of the altar of the olah: this proves that the statutory olah requires [sprinkling at] the base. - If so, just as there two applications which constitute four [are required], so here too, two applications which constitute four [are required]? — Said Abaye: Why must 'all around' be written in connection with both an olah and a chatas? That there might be two verses with the same teaching, and two verses with the same teaching do not illumine [other cases]. - That is well on the view that they do not illumine; but on the view that they do illumine, what can be said? — The asham is a third, and three certainly do not illumine. (56b4 – 57a1)

The *Mishnah* had stated: The *bechor* was eaten by *Kohanim*.

The *Baraisa* states: How do we know that the *bechor* is eaten for two days and one night? This as the verse states: *And their meat should be for you like the chest that was waved and the right thigh*. This indicates that we should compare the *bechor* to the chest and thigh of a *shelamim*. Just as the *shelamim* is eaten for two days and one night, so too a *bechor* is eaten for two days and one night.

This question was asked to the sages in Kerem b'Yavneh. For how long is a *bechor* eaten? Rabbi Tarfon answered: It is eaten for two days and one night.

There was a student who came before the sages in the study hall, and his name was Rabbi Yosi ha'Gelili. Rabbi Yosi ha'Gelili asked Rabbi Tarfon: Rabbi, how do you know this law? Rabbi Tarfon answered: My son, a *shelamim* and *bechor* are both *kodashim kalim*. Just as a *shelamim* is eaten for two days and one night, so too a *bechor* is eaten for two days and one night.

Rabbi Yosi answered: Part of the *bechor* is given to the *Kohen* (*but not the owner*), just as part of the *chatas* and *asham* are given to the *Kohen* (*but not the owner, as opposed to a shelamim where part is eaten by the owner*). We should therefore say that just as a *chatas* and *asham* are eaten for one day and one night, so too a *bechor* is eaten for one day and one night!

Rabbi Tarfon replied: Let us compare and derive topics that have similar laws. (*There is another similarity between bechor and shelamim, making bechor more comparable to shelamim than chatas and asham.*) Just as a *shelamim* is not brought due to a sin, so too a *bechor* is not brought due to a sin. We should therefore say that just as the *shelamim* is eaten for two days and one night, so too a *bechor* is eaten for two days and one night.

Rabbi Yosi answered: Let us compare and derive topics that have similar laws. Part of the *bechor* is given to the *Kohen*, just as part of the *chatas* and *asham* are given to the *Kohen*. Additionally, just as a *chatas* and *asham* cannot be brought voluntarily (*they are only brought due to a sin*), so too a *bechor* is not brought voluntarily (*it must be brought because it is a bechor*). We should therefore say that just as a *chatas* and *asham* are eaten for one day and one night, so too a *bechor* is eaten for one day and one night!

Rabbi Akiva jumped up (*to continue debating Rabbi Yosi*) and Rabbi Tarfon went away. (*Rashi says that he did not go away, but remained silent*.)

Rabbi Akiva said: This as the verse states: *And their meat should be for you etc.* This indicates that we should compare the *bechor* to the chest and thigh of a *shelamim*. Just as the *shelamim* is eaten for two days and one night, so too a *bechor* is eaten for two days and one night.

Rabbi Yosi ha'Gelili replied: You say we should compare it to the chest and thigh of a *shelamim*, and I say we should compare it to the chest and thigh of a *todah*. Just as a *todah* is eaten for one day and one night, so too a *bechor* is eaten for one day and one night.

Rabbi Akiva replied: The verse states: *And their meat should be for you etc.* It already said, *for you it should be*. Why does it repeat, *should be for you*? This must mean that it has another day to be eaten. (*Rashi explains that Rabbi Akiva admits that we should compare it to todah. However, being that there is an extra verse, it should be for you this indicates that the verse is adding another day on to the amount of time we would otherwise eat the bechor.*)

When these words were said before Rabbi Yishmael, he said to them: Go and tell Rabbi Akiva that you have made a mistake (*by admitting that the better comparison to bechor is the todah*). The law that the chest and thigh of a *todah* are given to the *Kohen* is derived from *shelamim*. Can a law that is derived from a *hekesh* (*from shelamim*) go back and teach due to this *hekesh* (*to make it more similar to bechor than the shelamim itself*)? You should compare it to *shelamim*, not *todah*.

The *Gemara* asks: What does Rabbi Yishmael do with the verse, *for you it should be*?

The *Gemara* answers: He derives from here that a *bechor* which has a blemish should be given to the *Kohen*, as there is no other source for this law.

The *Gemara* asks: Where did Rabbi Akiva derive this law from?

The *Gemara* answers: He derived it from *their flesh*. This indicates two different types of *bechor*, one without a blemish and one with a blemish.

The *Gemara* asks: What did Rabbi Yishmael do with this verse?

The *Gemara* answers: He understood this is referring to the meat of the different types of *bechoros* (*oxen, goats, etc.*). (57a1 – 57a3)

The *Gemara* asks: What is the crux of their argument?

The *Gemara* answers: We know the *todah* is eaten for one day and one night because of verses stated by the *todah*. The law that the chest and thigh of the *todah* is given to the *Kohen* and must be eaten for one day is derived from the fact that the *todah* itself is eaten for one night. Rabbi Yishmael holds that even though this law partially has its source in the verse itself, being that the *hekesh* is used from *shelamim*, it cannot derive to another *hekesh*. Rabbi Akiva argues that the fact that this *hekesh* also has its source in the laws of *todah* allows us to derive from *todah* to *bechor*, without this being deemed that the secondary source of a *hekesh* is teaching to another *hekesh*.

The *Gemara* asks: It is understandable if one holds that this is not called deriving from a *hekesh*. This is why the verse says: *And so should be done to the Tent of Meeting*. Just as one sprinkles one time above and seven times below from the blood of the bull of *Yom Kippur* in the Holy of Holies, so too one does this in the Sanctuary. Additionally, just as one sprinkles one time above and seven times below from the

blood of the goat of *Yom Kippur* in the Holy of Holies, so too one does this in the Sanctuary. (*Rashi explains that when the Torah mentions the par, it only mentions seven sprinkles below. When it mentions the goat, it mentions one above. We derive one from the other that each requires one above and seven below. We then derive through a hekesh that this must also be done in the Heichal.*) This is understandable according to Rabbi Akiva who says that this is not considered deriving a *hekesh* from a *hekesh*. However, how does Rabbi Yishmael explain this?

The *Gemara* answers: By the sprinkling, they are all derived from each other (*as opposed to todah, which is derived from shelamim, while shelamim is not derived from todah at all*).

Alternatively, the *Gemara* answers: The *hekesh* from the blood-sprinkling in the Holy of Holies to the sprinkling in the Sanctuary were learned once. (*In other words, this is one derivation, saying that whatever applies to the Kodesh Kodashim applies to the Heichal. This is as opposed to the laws regarding the chest and thigh of the todah which is similar to bechor, but is only part of the laws of todah through a derivation.*)

The *Gemara* asks: It is understandable if one says that this is considered a *hekesh*. This is as the verse states: *From your dwelling places you should bring bread for waving.* Why does it say *you should bring* (*as this was already indicated by the verse*)? This teaches that any other leaven breads that are brought should be brought from the same amount (*as by the shtei ha'lechem*). Just as these breads are one *isaron* per loaf (*as the verse says that they are two loaves totaling two esronim*), so too other leaven breads should be one *isaron* per loaf. If we are comparing to the *shtei ha'lechem*, why don't we say that just as the breads of the *shtei ha'lechem* were made out of two *esronim*, so too all ten breads are made out of a total of two *esronim*? The verse states: *They should be (teaching us to use an isaron each)*. We now realize this applies to leaven breads. How do we know this applies to unleavened breads as well? This is why the verse states, *on the loaf of a leavened bread*. This teaches that the same amount that is used for the leavened loaves should be used for the unleavened loaves. (*This shows that we derive from the shtei ha'lechem to regular loaves, and then from regular loaves to unleavened loaves.*) According to the opinion that we cannot derive in this fashion, how do we know that this is also the amount for unleavened loaves?

The *Gemara* answers: The extra word *you should bring* teaches us this. (*Rashi explains that the extra word makes it as if the amount for the unleavened loaves is explicitly stated by the unleavened loaves, and not just by the shtei ha'lechem. The hekesh is therefore a regular hekesh.*) (57a3 – 57b2)

Pesach Offering

The *Mishnah* had stated: The *pesach* offering is only eaten at night etc.

The *Gemara* asks: Who is the author of this *Mishnah*?

Rav Yosef answers: This must be Rabbi Elazar ben Azaryah. This is as the *Baraisa* states: Rabbi Elazar ben Azaryah says that the verse states, *on this night* (*regarding pesach*) and *I will pass through the land of Egypt on this night (regarding makkas bechoros).* Just as *makkas bechor*os was until (*i.e. at, and not after*) midnight, so too the *pesach* offering can only be eaten at midnight. Rabbi Akiva said to him: Doesn't the verse say: *and you will eat it hastily*, indicating until the time of haste (*they were not going to hastily leave until the next day*)? If so (*you might ask*), why does it say, *on this night*? This because you might think the *pesach* offering should be like all other *kodashim* that are eaten during the day. This is why the verse specifies that it is only eaten *on that night*.

Abaye asked Rav Yosef: How do you know that the *Mishnah* is according to Rabbi Elazar ben Azaryah and is discussing the Torah law? Perhaps it is according to Rabbi Akiva, who admits

that the Rabbis said it should only be eaten until midnight in order to ensure it is not eaten past daybreak?

Rav Yosef counters: If so, why would the *Mishnah* say, only until midnight? Rather, it must be that just as all of the laws discussed in the *Mishnah* are according to Torah law, so too the law regarding midnight is according to Rabbi Elazar ben Azaryah, and is Torah law. (57b2 – 57b3)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU,
EIZEHU MEKOMAN

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Whose Opinion Does the Shulchan Aruch Follow?

In the preface to his Haggadah, the Kesav Sofer asks that the Shulchan Aruch seems to contradict himself. In Orach Chaim (477:1), the Shulchan Aruch rules that one should be careful to eat the *afikomen* before *chatzos*. This indicates that he rules like the opinion of Rabbi Elazar ben Azaryah. However, later (481:2) he rules that a person is obligated to relate the story of going out of Egypt until "sleep grabs him." This indicates that there is an obligation the whole night to discuss going out of Egypt. The reason this implies he follows Rabbi Akiva's opinion is that there is only an obligation to relate the story of going out of Egypt "when *matzah* and *marror* is placed before you," meaning during a time when there is an obligation to eat *matzah*. It must be that the Shulchan Aruch holds there is still an obligation to eat *matzah* the whole night, as per the opinion of Rabbi Akiva! How can we reconcile this seeming contradiction?

The Kesav Sofer answers that the Shulchan Aruch is stringent according to both the opinion of Rabbi Elazar ben Azaryah and Rabbi Akiva. Accordingly, he says one should make sure to eat *matzah* before *chatzos*. However, he also rules that one must continue to relate the story of going out of Egypt the entire night, as per the opinion of Rabbi Akiva.

DAILY MASHAL

Rabbi Nachum from Chernobyl was once staying at a Jewish owned inn. At midnight, Reb Nachum recited *Tikkun Chatzos* with such emotion and tears that he awakened the innkeeper's family. The innkeeper rushed to Reb Nachum, asking if there was anything wrong. Reb Nachum responded, "Nothing hurts me except that the *Beis HaMikdash* is destroyed, and I am lamenting the destruction and the exile." The innkeeper wondered aloud, "What is this destruction and this exile that you are referring to?" Reb Nachum was amazed at the man's ignorance. "Do you not know? We once had a *Beis HaMikdash* and it was destroyed. We were once residing in *Eretz Yisroel* and were exiled from the Land. I am now beseeching Hashem that He should send us Mashiach to take us out of exile, and bring us to *Eretz Yisroel*. Are you prepared to go up to *Eretz Yisroel*?" The innkeeper responded, "Let me ask my wife. Who knows if it is really worthwhile to go to *Eretz Yisroel*?" He went to ask his wife, and immediately returned with an unequivocal response, "We will not be going up to *Eretz Yisroel*! How can we follow Mashiach and leave all our livestock here?" Reb Nachum did not give up so easily. "Is it so good here? The Cossacks are always inciting pogroms and murdering and plundering everything." The innkeeper did not know how to respond, so he went back to his wife, the "genius" with all the answers to his dilemmas. She told her husband, "Tell the Rebbe that he should pray to Hashem that He should immediately send the Cossacks to *Eretz Yisroel* and then we will be able to remain here in peace with all of our livestock."

By no longer tolerating the exile, we can begin to attain freedom. Becoming accustomed to living amongst the gentiles is what lengthens the days of the exile. Therefore, Hashem promised us that *I shall take you out from under the burdens of Egypt*, and subsequently *I shall rescue you from their service*.

L'zecher Nishmas HaRav Raphael Dov ben HaRav Yosef Yechezkel Marcus O"H