



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

But surely 'man' is written, and does that not intimate that [only] a man may offer voluntary but not obligatory sacrifices? — 'Man' is written to intimate that a zar is fit. - [The fitness of] a zar is deduced from: And the Kohen shall sprinkle the blood on the altar of Hashem [at the door of the Tent of Meeting]? — You might say, it requires the sanctification of the firstborn, as originally: hence it ['man'] informs us [that it is not so].

The Gemara asks: The Sages are identical with the first Tanna? — Rav Pappa said: They differ as to whether libations were offered in the wilderness. (118a1)

Bamos

The master had stated in the *Baraisa*: Rabbi Shimon says: Even the public only brought (on a bamah) *pesach* offerings and sacrifices that must be brought at a specific time.

What is the reasoning for this? It is written: *And the Children of Israel made the pesach offering in Gilgal*. Is this not obvious!? It must be that the verse is teaching us that only obligatory sacrifices, similar to the *pesach* offering, were offered on a major *bamah*; but if they are not similar to a *pesach* offering (*for they are not offered at a fixed time*), they cannot be offered. And the opinion who disagrees holds that this verse is needed for that which Rabbi Yochanan said in the name of Rabbi Benaah: An uncircumcised man is eligible to receive sprinkling (*from*

the water of purification if he was tamei from corpse tumah; he is, thereby, enabled to eat terumah immediately after the circumcision, no other sprinkling being required).

There was a teacher of *Baraisos* who taught the following *Baraisa* to Rav Adda bar Ahavah: There is no difference between a major *bamah* and a small one, except *pesach* sacrifices and offerings that have a set time. He told him: You must explain your teaching to be referring to an obligatory *olah* offering (*that may be offered on a major bamah*), as there is also a voluntary *olah* offering (*which can be offered on a minor bamah*). For if you would be referring to *chatas* offerings, is there then a voluntary *chatas* offering (*which can be offered on a minor bamah*)!?

The *Gemara* asks: Perhaps it was referring to an obligatory *minchah* offering, since there were *chavitin* (*the daily minchah offering of the Kohen Gadol - that may be offered on a major bamah*)?

The *Gemara* answers: He holds that there were no *minchah* offerings at a *bamah*. (118a1 – 118a2)

Shiloh

The *Mishnah* had stated: When they came to Shiloh (*there was no roof there, but only a house of stones below and curtains above*).



From where are these words known? Rabbi Chiya bar Abba in the name of Rabbi Yochanan cites the source for this: One verse says: *And she brought him to the house of Hashem in Shiloh*; whereas another verse says: *And He abandoned the Tabernacle of Shiloh, the tent which He had dwelled among men*; and it also says: *And He rejected the tent of Yosef, and did not choose the tribe of Ephraim*. How are these reconciled? [*Was it a house or a tent?*] It had no roof, but stones below and curtains above, and that constituted the “resting place” (*mentioned in the Torah*). (118a2 – 118a3)

The *Mishnah* had stated: *Kodshei kodashim (were eaten within the curtains of the Tabernacle, and kodashim kalim and ma'aser sheni were eaten anywhere within sight of Shiloh)*.

From where are these words known? Rabbi Oshaya cites the source for this: It is written: *Beware for yourself lest you offer your olos in any place that you see*. We may infer from here that you may not offer in any place that you see, but you may eat in any place that you see.

The *Gemara* asks: Perhaps we should infer as follows: In any place that you see you may not offer, but you may slaughter in any place that you see?

Rabbi Yannai said: It is written: *There shall you offer . . . and there shall you do*. [*Evidently, slaughtering must be done in the Courtyard!*]

Rabbi Avdimi bar Chassa said: It is written: *And to him there was Taanas Shiloh*. This was a place which made whoever saw it (*after the Mishkan's destruction*) to sigh for the sacrifices which he ate there.

Rabbi Avahu said: The Torah says: *Yosef is a fruitful son, a fruitful son through the eye*. Let the eye which would not

feed upon and enjoy that which did not belong to it (*Potifar's wife*), merit to eat from sacrifices as far as it can see.

Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina said: *And the desire of him that dwells in hatred*. Let the eye that did not desire to enjoy that which did not belong to it, merit to eat from sacrifices among those that hated it (*the tribes adjacent to Yosef's portion*). (118a3 – 118b1)

It was taught in a *Baraisa*: When they said that one may eat as far as the eye could see, they meant from wherever one could see Shiloh without anything interposing.

Rabbi Shimon ben Elyakim said an example to Rabbi Elozar: The synagogue of Maon (*is a place where there is no obstruction between it and Shiloh*).

Rav Pappa said: When they said that one must see Shiloh, they did not mean that one must see the entire Shiloh, but that one must see part of it.

Rav Pappa inquired: What if one could see it while standing, but not when sitting? Rabbi Yirmiyah inquired: What if one stood on the edge of the ravine one could see it, but when he sat in the ravine he could not see it? The *Gemara* leaves these questions unresolved. (118b1)

Binyamin's Portion

When Rav Dimi came he said in the name of Rebbe: The Divine Presence rested on Israel in three places: in Shiloh, in Nov and Gibeon, and in the Eternal House. And in all of these places, it rested only in the portion of Binyamin, for it is written: *He hovers over him all day*. All hoverings will be nowhere else but in Binyamin's portion.



Abaye went and told this over to Rav Yosef. Rav Yosef said to him: Kaylil (*Abaye's father*) had only one son, and he is not like he should be (*for he is lacking in his learning*). Surely it is written: *And He abandoned the Tabernacle of Shiloh*; and (*several verses later*) it is written: *And He rejected the tent of Yosef, and did not choose the tribe of Ephraim!?* [Evidently, *Shiloh was located in Ephraim's portion, not Binyamin's!?*]

Rav Adda answered: What is his difficulty? Perhaps the Divine Presence was in Binyamin's portion, while the Great Sanhedrin was in Yosef's portion! This is found by the Eternal House, where the Divine Presence was in Binyamin's portion, whereas the Great Sanhedrin was in Yehudah's portion!

The *Gemara* asks on the comparison: There the portions of Yehudah and Binyamin were next to each other; but here, were they contiguous (*the portion of Binyamin and Shiloh*)?

The *Gemara* answers: They were indeed contiguous, as Rabbi Chama the son of Rabbi Chanina said: [*The Temple Mount, the Chambers, and the Courtyards of the Bais HaMikdash were located in the portion of the tribe of Yehudah. The Ulam, the Heichal, and the Chamber of the Holy of Holies were located in the portion of the tribe of Binyamin.*] A strip of land extended from the portion of Yehudah and entered into the portion of Binyamin, and the altar was built on that portion. Binyamin the Righteous foresaw the intrusion of Yehudah into his territory and this caused him great distress, and Binyamin desired to absorb that strip into his territory. So too here (*in Shiloh*), a strip of land extended from the portion of Yosef and entered into the portion of Binyamin, and that is the meaning of Taanas Shiloh (*for Binyamin was distressed that he lost having the Sanhedrin reside in his portion*).

The *Gemara* notes: This (*if the Tabernacle in Shiloh resided in Yosef's portion or Binyamin's*) is actually a dispute amongst *Tannaim*, for it was taught in a *Baraisa*: [*The verse regarding Binyamin*] *He hovers over him* - this alludes to the first Temple; *all day* - this alludes to the second Temple (*but not the Mishkan*); and *He dwells between his shoulders* - this refers to the days of the Messiah. Rebbe said: *He hovers over him* - this alludes to this world (*including Mishkan Shiloh*); *all day* - this alludes to the days of the Messiah; and *He dwells between his shoulders* - this refers to the World to Come. (118b1 - 118b2)

Duration of Time

The *Gemara* cites a *Baraisa*: The duration of the Tent of Meeting in the Wilderness was forty years less one. The duration of the Tent of Meeting in Gilgal was fourteen years; the seven years of conquering the Land and the seven of dividing it up. The duration of the Tent of Meeting at Nov and Gibeon totaled fifty-seven years. There remained for Shiloh - three hundred and seventy less one.

The *Gemara* cites the sources for these facts: The duration of the Tent of Meeting in the Wilderness was forty years less one is derived from that which a master said: In the first year (*since the exodus from Egypt*) Moshe made the Tabernacle; in the second the Tabernacle was set up, and Moshe sent out the spies (*in this year as well*).

The duration of the Tent of Meeting in Gilgal was fourteen years; the seven years of conquering the Land and the seven of dividing it up. This is derived from that which Calev said: *Forty years old was I when Moshe the servant of Hashem sent me from Kadesh Barnea to spy out the Land; and I brought him back word as it was in my heart*; and it is written: *and now, behold, I am this day eighty-five years old*. How old was he when he crossed the Jordan? Seventy eight years old, and he said (*at the time they*



began to divide the Land), I am this day eighty-five years old. Evidently, there were seven years for the conquering. And how do we know that there were seven years of division? You can say, since the conquering took seven years, the dividing too took seven years as well. Alternatively, because otherwise, there would be no explanation for the verse: *In the fourteenth year after that the city had fallen.*

The Tent of Meeting at Nov and Gibeon totaled fifty-seven years. How do we know it? — Because it is written: And it came to pass, when he made mention of the Ark of God, [that he fell from off his chair . . . and died]. Now it was taught in a Baraisa: When Eli the Kohen died, Shiloh was destroyed and they came to Nov; when Shmuel the Ramahite died, Nov was destroyed and they went to Gibeon. - And it is written: And it came to pass, from the day that the Ark rested in Kiryas-Ye-arim, that the days accumulate, and it was twenty years; and all the House of Israel yearned after Hashem. These twenty years [were made up as follows]: Ten years during which Shmuel ruled alone, one year that Shmuel and Saul ruled [together], two years that Saul reigned, and the seven which David reigned [in Chevron], for it is written: And the days that David reigned over Israel were forty years: seven years he reigned in Hebron, [and thirty and three years he reigned in Jerusalem]. Now of Solomon it is written: And he began to build . . . in the fourth year of his reign. Thus three hundred and seventy less one was left for Shiloh. (118b3 – 119a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Gemara Kup

The Brisker Rav used our *Gemara* and Rashi as an example which demonstrates the distinction between the small-mindedness" of human intellect and that of the "*seichel*

haTorah." Our *Gemara* states that the Ohel Moed resided in Gilgal for fourteen years. How is this known? Since it required seven years for the Jewish people to conquer *Eretz Yisroel*, so too it took seven years to divide up the Land. Rashi writes that this is a logical analogy (*sevara b'alma*). Now, would any person - even the most exceptionally bright mind, be able to comprehend that this is a simple logic: if seven years were needed to conquer the land, seven years were required to divide it up?! The Chazon ish comments on our *Gemara*: To understand such a logic requires a great teacher! What is the connection between conquering and dividing?!

DAILY MASHAL

Daughters Walked on a Wall

Chazal interpreted from a verse that in the era of the Sanctuary of Shilo, which was in Yosef's portion, people ate *kodoshim* wherever they could **see** the Sanctuary but in the Temple *kodshim* were eaten only within the city walls. The *Chidushei HaRim* zt"l said that that is the explanation of the verse about Yosef "a favored son to the eye" (Bereishis 49:32). By Yosef the sanctity spread to where the eye could see. But "daughters walked on a wall" – by the other tribes the sanctity only reached the wall.