

24 Elul 5781
Sept. 1, 2021



Sukkah Daf 56

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

The Gemara cites a Baraisa: From where is it known that all (twenty-four) watches were equal in the division of the lechem hapanim?¹ It was stated: From Scripture which teaches: They shall have portion to portion to eat, meaning, as the division of the service [is equal for all], so is the division of the food. Now what food [could this mean]? If you will say that it means the sacrifices, do we not deduce that from a different verse: It shall be the Kohen's that offers it? Consequently, it must refer to the lechem hapanim. As one might assume that the same applies also to obligatory offerings that are offered on the Festival, though not on account of the Festival, Scripture explicitly teaches: Except for that which is sold according to the fathers' houses; now what is it that the fathers have sold to each other? [The week allotted to each course, each one having agreed] 'I shall be in charge in my week and you in your week'. (55b3 – 56a1)

The Mishnah had stated: On Shavuot they used to say to the Kohen etc. It was stated: Rav ruled: The blessing (of Kiddush on the first night of Sukkos) of the Sukkah comes first and then that of z'man (Shehecheyanu). Rabbah bar Chanah ruled: The blessing of z'man is first and then that of the Sukkah.

The Gemara explains: Rav ruled that the blessing of the Sukkah comes first and then that of z'man, since the obligation of the day is more important. Rabbah bar Chanah ruled that the blessing of z'man is first, since that

which is more frequent precedes that which is less frequent.

The Gemara asks: Must we say that Rav and Rabbah bar Chanah differ on the same principles as those on which Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel differed? For our Rabbis have taught a Baraisa: These are the points of difference between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel with regard to meals: Beis Shammai rule that one (when reciting Kiddush Friday night, or the night of the festivals) recites the blessing of the day and then the blessing over the wine, whereas Beis Hillel rule that one recites the blessing over the wine and then the blessing of the day. Beis Shammai rule that one recites the blessing of the day and then the blessing over the wine, since it is the day which causes the wine to come (prior to the meal), and [furthermore] the sanctification of the day (at nightfall) comes before the bringing of the wine (so the blessing on the day should precede that of the wine). Beis Hillel rule that one recites the blessing over the wine first and then the blessing of the day, since the wine causes the sanctification to be recited. Another reason: The blessing over wine is more frequent and the blessing of the day less frequent, and that which is more frequent takes precedence over that which is less frequent. The Gemara concludes: Now must we say that Rav is in agreement with Beis Shammai and Rabbah bar Chanah with Beis Hillel?

The Gemara answers: No, Rav can answer you: I may uphold my view even according to Beis Hillel, for Beis Hillel

¹ When a Yom Tov fell out on the Shabbos.

maintain their ruling only in that case, since the wine causes the sanctification to be recited, but not in this case, since even if there were no blessing of z'man, do we not say the blessing of the Sukkah? And Rabbah bar bar Chanah can answer you: I may maintain my view even according to Beis Shammai, for Beis Shammai gave their ruling only in that case, since it is the day which causes the wine to be brought, but not in this case, since even without a Sukkah, do we not recite the blessing of z'man?

The *Gemara* asks on Rav from our *Mishnah*: On Shavuot they used to say to the Kohen: Here is matzah (lechem hapanim) for you, and here is chametz (the shtei halechem that was offered on Shavuot). Now here, surely, the chametz is the essential feature of the day, and the matzah is of lesser significance, and yet it teaches: Here is matzah for you, and here is chametz? Is this then not a refutation of Rav?

Rav can answer you: This point is one in dispute between Tannaim, for it has been taught in a *Baraisa*: 'Here is matzah for you, here is chametz'. Abba Shaul, [however] stated: [They said,] 'Here is chametz for you, here is matzah'.

Rav Nachman bar Rav Chisda expounded: The law is not according to Rav who said: blessing (of Kiddush on the first night of Sukkos) of the Sukkah comes first and then that of z'man (Shehecheyanu), but first [is the blessing of] z'man and then [is that of] the Sukkah. Rav Sheishes the son of Rav Idi however, laid down: First [the blessing of] the Sukkah and then [that of] the z'man; and the law is that the blessing of Sukkah is first and then follows that of the z'man. (56a1 – 56a3)

The Mishnah had stated: The watch whose time of service was fixed etc., And all other remaining communal

² When there were not sufficient private offerings to supply the Altar, freewill-offerings were offered from the public funds.

offerings. What does [this] include? — It includes the bull brought as a result of a transgression caused by the forgetfulness of the congregation and the he-goats brought as an atonement for idolatry. (56a3)

The Mishnah had stated: And it offered them all. What does this include? — It includes the "dessert" of the Altar.² (56a3)

MISHNAH: If a festival fell next to the Shabbos, either before (on a Friday) or after it (on a Sunday), all the watches shared equally in the distribution of the lechem hapanim. If one day intervened between them, the watch whose period of service was fixed [for that week] took ten [of the] loaves, while they that were detained took two. On all other days of the year the incoming watch took six loaves and the outgoing watch six. Rabbi Yehudah stated: the incoming watch took seven and the outgoing five. The incoming watch divided it in the north, and the outgoing in the south. [The watch of] Bilgah always divided it in the south, since their ring was permanently affixed and their alcove was blocked up. (56a4)

GEMARA: What is meant by 'before' and what by 'after'? If you will say that 'before' refers to the first day of the festival (fell on a Friday) and 'after' to the last day of the festival (falling on a Sunday), isn't then [the Shabbos referred to] the very Shabbos during the festival? But the fact is that 'before' refers to the last day of the festival³ and 'after' refers to the first day of the festival.⁴ What is the reason? — Since the one watch needed to arrive early and the other needed to leave late, the Rabbis made the provision in order that they might have their meals together. (56a5)

³ The last day of the festival fell on a Friday.

⁴ The first day of the festival fell on a Sunday.

The Mishnah had stated: If one day intervened. - But why the extra two?⁵ – Rabbi Yitzchak answered: They were a reward for the closing of the doors.⁶ But [why shouldn't the outgoing watch] say to the other, 'Remove for remove'?⁷ — Abaye replied: 'A small gourd [in hand] is better than a large one [later]'.

Rav Yehudah stated: In the same manner they divided the Mussaf offerings. An objection was raised: 'The outgoing watch offered the morning tamid and the mussaf offerings, and the incoming watch offered the evening tamid and the spoons of frankincense'; but it does not state, [does it,] that they divided the additional offerings? — That Tanna does not deal with the question of division. Rav objected: But the Tanna cited at the school of Shmuel does deal with the question of division, and yet does not mention the division of the mussaf offerings, for at the school of Shmuel it was taught: The outgoing watch offered the morning tamid and the mussaf offerings; the incoming watch offered the evening tamid and the spoons of frankincense; four Kohanim entered there, two from one watch and two from the other and they divided the lechem hapanim. But it does not mention that they divided the mussaf offerings. Isn't this a refutation of Rav Yehudah? It is indeed a refutation. (56b1 – 56b2)

The Mishnah had stated: The incoming watch divided it in the north. Our Rabbis taught: The incoming Kohanim divided their shares in the north in order that it should be seen that they were the incoming watch, and the outgoing Kohanim divided theirs in the south, so that it should be seen that they were the outgoing watch. (56b2)

The Mishnah had stated: [The watch of] Bilgah always divided it in the south. Our Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: It

⁵ The question concerns Rabbi Yehudah. Why, according to him, does the incoming watch receive two more loaves than the outgoing one?

happened that Miriam the daughter of Bilgah (who was a Levi, and served in the Temple) apostatized and married an officer of the Greek kings. When the Greeks entered the Sanctuary (at the time of the story of Chanukah), she stamped with her sandal upon the altar, exclaiming, Lukos! Lukos! [Wolf! Wolf!] How long will you consume Israel's money! And yet you do not stand by them in a time of pressing need!' And when the Sages heard of the incident, they made her ring immovable and sealed up her alcove (meaning her entire family was no longer permitted to serve in the Temple). Some however, say that the watch [of Bilgah] was tardy in coming and [that of] Yesheivav, his brother, replaced him and served in their stead. — And although the neighbors of the wicked do not profit [from their proximity] the neighbors of Bilgah did have profit, since [after the imposition of the penalty, the watch of] Bilgah always divided their shares in the south, while that of his brother Yesheivav did it in the north. - It is well according to the one who stated that his watch was tardy in coming, since for this reason the whole watch might well be penalized; but according to the one who stated that it was Miriam the daughter of Bilgah who apostatized, do we [it may be objected] penalize [even a] father on account of his daughter? Yes, replied Abaye, as people say: 'The talk of the child in the market-place, is either that of his father or of his mother'. May we then penalize the whole watch on account of her father or mother? — 'Woe', replied Abaye, to the wicked, woe to his neighbor; it is well with the righteous and well with his neighbor; as it is said: Say to the righteous, that it shall be well with him, for they shall eat the fruits of their deeds. (56b2 – 56b3)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, HECHALIL
AND TRACTATE SUKKAH IS CONCLUDED

⁶ The incoming watch needed to close the Temple Gates which the outgoing watch had left open.

⁷ Forgo this enactment now and when it is your turn to go out, the next incoming course will forgo it as well.

DAILY MASHAL

The Gemara relates an incident involving the Altar that had broad-reaching implications: It happened that Miriam the daughter of Bilgah (who was a Levi, and served in the Temple) apostatized and married an officer of the Greek kings. When the Greeks entered the Sanctuary (at the time of the story of Chanukah), she stamped with her sandal upon the altar, exclaiming, Lukos! Lukos! [Wolf! Wolf!] How long will you consume Israel's money! And yet you do not stand by them in a time of pressing need!' And when the Sages heard of the incident, they made her ring immovable and sealed up her alcove (meaning her entire family was no longer permitted to serve in the Temple). The Gemara later asks: Do we penalize a father on account of his daughter? Yes, replied Abaye, as the proverb has it: The talk of the child in the marketplace expresses the views of either of his father or of his mother."

Miriam was from a distinguished family, a family that had the great privilege to perform the service in the Temple in Jerusalem. However, Miriam never gained an appreciation for how great an honor it was for her family to serve. She demonstrated contempt to the Altar, by stomping on it and cursing it. For this action, her entire family was punished. Why was the whole family punished? Why was it decreed that her entire family no longer perform the holy service in the Temple? Because, explained Abaye, the disrespect she displayed toward the Temple did not just emerge from a vacuum. She learned this insolence, or lack of appreciation, for the Temple and the Altar from her parents.

Children formulate opinions and follow beliefs based on their education. This education by no means is just from formal schooling. This education comes from how the child sees his or her parents act and interact. When a child sees a parent value an ideal, person, or item, this creates an impression on the child. When a child sees a parent despise and ridicule an ideal, person, or item, this creates

an impression as well. These lessons, the ones acted out before a child's eyes on a daily basis, are often the ones that are ingrained in a child's memory for years. These lessons are the ones that remain throughout life. The lesson that sacrifices on the Altar were a waste was the lesson that Miriam learned from her parents. Because her family showed disdain toward the Temple, Miriam carried this attitude with her, and displayed it in a most vivid fashion. Therefore, Miriam's whole family was punished, and could no longer serve in the Temple.