



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

Bulls, Rams and Sheep

The *Mishna* stated that the bulls, rams, and sheep of the sacrifices are independent.

The *Gemora* asks which bulls, rams, and sheep it is referring to. It cannot be the ones brought on *Sukkos*, as the verse says that they must be brought *kamishpat* – *as per the law*, mandating that it be brought exactly as specified. If it is referring to the sacrifices of *Rosh Chodesh* and *Shavuos*, specified in the book of *Bamidbar*, then it should not mention “rams,” as on these days only one ram is brought. The rams cannot be referring to the two rams brought with the two loaves of bread on *Shavuos* (*as mandated in the book of Vayikra*), as the verse says that *yih’yu* – *they will be*, requiring them to be brought as described. Rather, the rams mentioned in the *Mishna* means that the rams mentioned in *Vayikra* and the ram mentioned in *Bamidbar* are independent of each other, but the rams mentioned in *Vayikra* are one unit.

The *Gemora* notes that this makes the list of the *Mishna* inconsistent, since then the bulls and sheep mentioned in the *Mishna* means that they are all independent sacrifices, while the rams only means that the groups of rams are independent of each other. Even so, the *Gemora* says this is valid, since the *Mishna* is simply enumerating instances of independent segments of sacrifices. (44b – 45a)

The Verses in the Book of Yechezkel

The *Gemora* proceeds to explain the verses in *Yechezkel* which describe the sacrifices to be brought on the first of *Nissan*.

- The verse begins by saying that you should bring a bull, six sheep, and a ram. The verse lists a (*single*) bull to teach that even though we are required to offer two bulls on *Rosh Chodesh*, if we have only one, we should still offer it.
- The verse lists six sheep to teach that even if we do not have the seven sheep that are required on *Rosh Chodesh*, we should offer what we have.
- The later verse, which says that you should offer sheep “*as you can afford*,” teaches that we should offer what we have, even if it is less than six, while this verse teaches that we should offer as many as we do have.
- The verse concludes that *yih’yu* – *they will be*, teaching that if we *do* have all of them, they must all be brought. Later, the verse says that on the first of *Nissan*, you should take a bull, and *chitaisa* – *you will purify the Beis Hamikdash (Temple)*.

The *Gemora* asks why the verse refers to this offering, which is an *olah* – *burnt offering* as a *chatas* – *sin offering*.

Rabbi Yochanan says that Eliyahu Hanavi will resolve this seeming contradiction when he arrives at the redemption.

Rav Ashi explains that when the Jews will return from exile and sanctify the new *Beis Hamikdash*, they will bring inaugural sacrifices, just as they did in the *Mishkan (Tabernacle)*. Just as the final day of inauguration of the *Mishkan* on the first of *Nissan* included a *chatas* calf, so the first of *Nissan* in the future inauguration will include a *chatas* bull. This is the bull which *Yechezkel* refers to.



The *Gemora* cites a supporting *braisa*, in which Rabbi Yehudah says that Eliyahu Hanavi will have to resolve this seeming contradiction, while Rabbi Yosi explains that it refers to the *chatas* to be brought as part of the future inauguration.

Rabbi Yehudah then blessed Rabbi Yosi, who calmed him with his explanation. The *Gemora* cites a similar instance of a seeming contradiction from the verse in *Yechezkel*. The verse says that the kohanim should not eat any bird or animal which was not slaughtered properly, implying that other Jews may do so, while the Torah forbids anyone from eating them. Rabbi Yochanan says that Eliyahu Hanavi will resolve this seeming contradiction, while Ravina explains that *Yechezkel* specifically mentioned the *Kohanim*, not to exclude all others, but because we may have thought that they may eat non-slaughtered birds, since they are allowed to eat bird sacrifices killed by *melikah* – (the Kohen “slaughters” the bird by piercing the back of the bird’s neck with his thumbnail), which is an invalid form of slaughtering.

The verse continues to say that you should also offer these sacrifices *b’shivah baChodesh* - on the seventh of the month, *m’ish shogeh imipesi* – from one who erred, and one without knowledge. Rabbi Yochanan explains that this verse is not referring to a day of the month, but rather to a case when *shivah* – seven tribes who sinned due to an incorrect ruling. If the court ruled something *chadash* [like *Chodesh*]– new, which was incorrect, then when they were *shogeh* – erring, because of *pesi* – lack of [correct] knowledge, they must offer a sacrifice.

Rav Yehudah quotes Rav extolling the memory of Chanina ben Chizkiyah. Due to the seeming contradictions between the Torah and verses in *Yechezkel*, people wanted to conceal it. Chanina went to an upper room with a long lasting candle, and proceeded to resolve all the seeming contradictions, redeeming the book of *Yechezkel* from concealment.

The *braisa* explains the verse in *Yechezkel*, which says that “a measure should be brought for the bull, and a measure for the ram, and for the sheep what you can afford, and hin of oil for the *minchah*.” Rabbi Shimon explains that the measures for the

bull and ram teaches that even if one does not have enough to buy all the sacrifices, each sacrifice that is brought must be brought with its corresponding offering of wine, even if that precludes bringing all the sacrifices. (45a – 45b)

Shavuos Sacrifices

The *Mishna* says that the *olah* – burnt bulls, rams, sheep, and goat of *Shavuos* are independent of the two breads, and the breads are independent of them. Rabbi Akiva says that the *shelamim* sheep of *Shavuos* cannot be brought without the breads, but the breads can be brought without the sheep. Rabbi Shimon ben Nanas says that sheep can be brought without the breads, as we find that the Jews brought just the sheep in the desert, but the breads cannot be brought without the sheep. Rabbi Shimon rules like Ben Nanas, but disputes his reasoning, since he says that the sheep were also not brought in the Wilderness. He rules that the sheep can be brought alone, since they make themselves permitted, but the breads cannot be brought along, since only the sheep makes them permitted.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which explains the verse mandating the sacrifices to be brought with the breads. The verse starts by saying that you must offer “for the breads,” teaching that these sacrifices are brought due to the breads. The verse continues, listing the animals to be brought, teaching that they are brought even if there are no breads.

Rabbi Tarfon says that the start of the verse still associates them with the breads to teach that the Jews were only obligated in the sacrifices once they were obligated in the breads.

The verse cited in the *braisa* (in *Vayikra*) mandates seven sheep, a bull, and two rams for *Shavuos*, while the verse in *Bamidbar* lists seven sheep, two bulls, and a ram. Rabbi Akiva says that although the same number of sheep are listed, the numbers of bulls and rams does not match, teaching that the two lists are different lists of sacrifices, and even the sheep are two separate sets of sheep. The sacrifices listed in *Vayikra* are brought due to the bread, while those in *Bamidbar* are independent. In the



Wilderness, where they did not offer the breads, they were only obligated in the sacrifices listed in *Bamidbar*.

The *Gemora* explains that since the bulls and rams do not match, we assume that the sheep are different sets. Although we may have thought that the mismatch in the number of bulls and rams indicates that we may bring two of one of the species, and one of the other, the verses also differ in the order of the animals, showing that the full lists are two separate sets of sacrifices. (45b)

What “will be”?

The *Gemora* discusses the source for the dispute between Rabbi Akiva and Ben Nanas. The final verse about the breads states that the *Kohen* will wave the sacrifices on the breads, and on the two *shelamim* sheep, concluding that *yi’hyu* – they will be sanctified to Hashem, to the *Kohen*. The verse’s use of the word *yi’hyu* is stating that *this* is integral to the process described.

The *Gemora* explains that Rabbi Akiva and Ben Nanas differ in the understanding of this verse and its requirement. Rabbi Akiva says it refers to the bread, teaching that without them, the other sacrifices are not brought, while Ben Nanas says it refers to the sheep, teaching that the breads are not offered without them.

The *Gemora* offers two options for the differing readings of this verse.

1. There are two earlier verses discussing the breads and their sacrifices:
 - a. The verse says that the breads *ti’hyena* – will be fine flour.
 - b. The verse continues to list the sacrifices to be brought with the breads, saying that *yi’hyu ola* – they will be a burnt offering to Hashem.

Ben Nanas says that we learn from the second verse that has the exactly same form of the word (*yi’hyu*), as opposed to the one which has the different form (*ti’hyena*). Although one can learn from a verse which has a similar, but not identical, word,

we prefer one that has an identical word. Therefore, this verse refers to the sacrifices, making them necessary.

Rabbi Akiva says that we learn from the first verse (*about the bread*), since both refer to something the *Kohen* receives, as opposed to the verse about the *olah*, which is fully burnt. Therefore, this verse refers to the breads, making them necessary.

2. Rabbi Akiva says that the concluding verse is referring to the breads, since the verse says they will be holy “to Hashem, to the *Kohen*,” and only the breads are totally given to the *Kohen*.

Ben Nanas says that the verse says that it is a gift to Hashem, to the *Kohen*. This refers to the *shelamim*, of which some is offered on the altar (*to Hashem*), and some is given to the *Kohen*. Rabbi Akiva says that the verse does not say to Hashem *and* to the *Kohen*, which would imply *shelamim*, but rather to Hashem, to the *Kohen*, which implies the bread, which is offered to Hashem, who then gave it all to the *Kohen* as a gift. (45b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

An Error in Mussaf

By: Meoros HaDaf HaYomi

Since the destruction of the Temple and the discontinuation of the sacrifices, we substitute them with our prayers. The Ashkenazic custom (*Remo, O.C. 488:3*) is to mention in *mussaf* on *Shabbos* and holidays the verses about the sacrifices offered on those days. Usually those who pray concentrate and take care to match the verses to the date but the *poskim* did not neglect those who become confused and make mistakes.

Sukkos: a season for errors: Errors are more common in *mussaf* for *Sukkos*, when the number of sacrifices offered each day is not the same: on the first day 13 bulls were sacrificed and afterwards their number lessened to seven bulls on the seventh day.

Saying *al hanissim* in the middle of summer: All agree that omitting to say the verses of the sacrifices is no obstacle to *mussaf* and it suffices to say “and there we shall make before You the sacrifices of our obligations, *temidim* in their order and *mussafim* according to their *halachah*” (*Shulchan ‘Aruch, O.C. 268:4*). But the question arises whether saying verses that have nothing to do with the subject are considered an interruption in prayer. This issue pertains not only to verses of the sacrifices but also to mistakenly saying *al hanissim* in the midst of summer or mentioning *Ya’aleh veyavo* in the middle of the month or similar errors. The *poskim* disagreed as to if one must recite the prayer anew (*Chayei Adam, klal 28:13; Mishneh Berurah, 488, S.K. 13; Taz, end of 108; Responsa Shoel Umeishiv, 4th edition, II, 108*).

Types of errors: If we want to find out if an error in the verses of the sacrifices is considered as pronouncing an irrelevant topic, we must distinguish between two types of errors: an error in the number of **sacrifices** and an error in the number of **days**. First we shall address the first type of error which also includes two possibilities: a person could **lessen** the required number of sacrifices or **add** to them.

Sukkos differs from other holidays: According to *Pischei Teshuvah* (488:3 and 663:1), all opinions agree that verses of the *mussafim* pronounced in error are not considered a prayer out of time, except during Sukkos, when someone who mentions verses irrelevant to that day is considered as interjecting irrelevancies. After all, our *Gemora* explains that not offering one *mussaf* does not prevent the offering of another. Sukkos is an exception, when the sacrifices depend on each other and in the absence of one of them, one mustn’t sacrifice the other *mussafim* (see Sukkah 47a). Therefore, one who recites a lesser number of sacrifices on other holidays is not considered as having mentioned an event not in its time, as even in the Temple sacrificing less *mussafim* than required does not disqualify those that were sacrificed. But someone who does so during Sukkos is considered as mentioning an event out of time as in the Temple detracting from the number of sacrifices required during Sukkos disqualifies the sacrifices that were offered. Consequently, this person remains in the dispute of the *poskim* as to whether one who interjects a prayer out of its proper time should pray anew.

(This is also not simple, as mentioned in Responsa *Sheivet HaLevi*, IV, 63, because Rambam did not rule according to our *sugya*, and see *Minchas Chinuch*, mitzvah 320, *os 1*, according to which the person fulfilled his obligation even during Sukkos).

So much for a person who detracted from the required number of sacrifices but what about erroneously reciting a verse that adds to their number? In this case, the question is if adding a none-required detail changes all the details and disqualifies them. This question, addressed in a number of places, is also dealt with in our *sugya*, which rules: “What is this like? This resembles a student whose teacher told him, “Bring me wheat” and he brought him wheat and barley, that he didn’t violate his words but added to his words.” In other words, the addition stands by itself and doesn’t disqualify the mission, which was duly fulfilled. Therefore, some wanted to prove that, according to all opinions, someone who mentions a greater number of sacrifices does not disqualify his prayer (*Chavalim Bine’imim, II, HaMeasef, O.C., os 13*).

We are left with the last error: someone who errs in the date. For example, on the **second** day, when **12** bulls are sacrificed, he said “and on the **third day, 12 bulls**”. HaGaon Rav S. Wosner (*ibid*) adopts the opinion that he need not repeat the *mussaf* prayer as even a *Kohen* who offered the sacrifices in the Temple thinking of the wrong day did not disqualify the sacrifices (see Responsa *Minchas Yitzchak*, VIII, 49).

As for the *halachah*, *Mishneh Berurah* rules according to *Chayei Adam*, that any unwitting error is not considered an interruption requiring to pray anew.