



B”H

Likkutei Sichos Source Sheet

Volume 16 | Vayikra | Sichah 4

לעילוי נשמת רבקה אלה בת ר' יששכר דוב ליום היארצייט א' אדר ב'

Sponsored by Chanie Greenfeld

1 פרשתינו ב', א'

וּנְפֹשׁ קִי־תִקְרִיב קָרְבָּן מִנְחָה לַיהוָה סֶלֶת יִהְיֶה קָרְבָּנוֹ וַיִּצַק עָלֶיהָ שֶׁמֶן וַיִּתֵּן עָלֶיהָ לְבָנָה:

And if a person brings a meal offering to the Lord, his offering shall be of fine flour. He shall pour oil over it and place frankincense upon it.

2 תורת כהנים

ומנין שהיחיד מתנדב עצים, תלמוד לומר "קרבן" מלמד שהיחיד מתנדב עצים...

How do we know that an individual can donate wood? The word 'sacrifice' teaches us that an individual can donate wood.

היחיד מתנדב עצים..

An individual may donate wood.

כשם שאין שנים מביאין מנחה נדבה כך אין מביאין לא יין ולא לבונה ולא עצים.

Just as two people can't donate a 'Mincha', they also can't bring wine, frankincense and wood.

3 תענית כ"ו, א' ואילך

זמן עצי כהנים והעם, תשעה:

The mishna details the times for the wood offering of priests and the people. These were private holidays specific to certain families, on which their members would volunteer a wood offering for the altar. There were nine such days and families:

תנו רבנן: למה הוצרכו לומר זמן עצי כהנים והעם? אמרו: כשעלו בני הגולה לא מצאו עצים בלשכה, ועמדו אלו והתנדבו משלהם

The Sages taught: Why was it necessary to state the times for the wood offering of priests and the people? They said in response that this is what happened: When the people of the exile ascended to Jerusalem in the beginning of the Second Temple period, they did not find enough wood in the Temple chamber for the needs of the altar. And these families arose and donated from their own wood to the Temple.

וכך התנו נביאים שביניהן: שאפילו לשכה מלאה עצים יהיו אלו מתנדבין משלהן, שנאמר: "והגורלות הפלנו על קרבן העצים הכהנים הלויים והעם להביא לבית אלהינו לבית אבותינו לעתים מזמנים שנה בשנה לבער על מזבח ה' אלהינו ככתוב בתורה".

And the prophets among them stipulated as follows, that even if the entire chamber were full of wood, the descendants of these families would donate wood from their own property on these specific days, as it is stated: "And we cast lots, the priests, the Levites and the people, for the wood offering, to bring it into the house of our God, according to our fathers' houses, at appointed times year by year, to burn upon the altar of the Lord our God, as it is written in the Torah" (Nehemiah 10:35). Although these donations were not always necessary, it was established that all generations would observe these days.

4) תוספתא תענית פ"ג, ה'

מה ראו זמן עצי כהנים והעם לימנות [שכשעלו] בני הגולה לא מצאו עצים בלשכה [עמדו אלו והתנדבו עצים משל עצמן ומסרו לצבור וכן התנדבו עמהן הנביאים שאפילו לשכה מלאה עצים ואפילו עצים משל צבור ועמדו אלו והתנדבו עצים משל עצמן לא יהא קרבן מתקרב אלא משלהם תחלה]...

Why is the 'time of wood of the Kohanim and common folk' counted?

Because when the Yidden ascended from exile, there wasn't wood stored away. These families donated. Therefore, even if there is a full treasure of wood, if they donate, their wood takes precedence.

ב

5 מנחות כ', ב'

דתניא קרבן (מנחה) מלמד שמתנדבין עצים וכמה שני גזרין וכן הוא אומר (נחמיה י', לה) והגורלות הפלנו על קרבן העצים רבי אמר עצים קרבן מנחה הן וטעונין מלח וטעונין הגשה

it is taught in a *baraita*: The verse states: “And when one brings a meal offering [*korban minḥa*]” (Leviticus 2:1). The superfluous word *korban* teaches that one can voluntarily give wood as an offering for the altar. And how much wood must one bring if he does not specify an amount? Two logs. And the support for the fact that wood can be brought as a voluntary offering is from a verse, as the verse states: “And we cast lots for the wood offering” (Nehemiah 10:35). Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: This voluntary donation of wood is an offering like a meal offering, and therefore it requires salt and requires bringing to the corner of the altar, like a meal offering.

ואמר רבא לדברי רבי עצים טעונין קמיצה וא"ר פפא לדברי רבי עצים צריכין עצים

And Rava says: According to the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, wood donated in this manner requires the removal of a handful, just as in the case of a meal offering, a portion of the wood must be removed and sacrificed separately. And Rav Pappa says that according to the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, since it is an offering for the altar, the wood that is brought as an offering needs to be placed on other wood to burn, like any other offering that is burned on wood on the altar. Apparently, this means that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, who holds that the wood is termed an offering, also holds that it requires the application of salt, in contrast to the ruling in the *baraita*.

ג

6 מנחות ק"ז, א'

תנו רבנן (במדבר טו, יג) אזרח מלמד שמתנדבין יין וכמה שלשה לוגין

GEMARA: The Torah states with regard to libations: “All that are native born shall do these things in this manner, in presenting an offering made by fire, of a pleasing aroma to the Lord” (Numbers 15:13). As this verse is superfluous, the various terms in it are used to derive *halakhot*. The term “native born” teaches that one may pledge libations independently, even when they are not sacrificed together with an offering. And how much is the minimum size that is offered? Three *log*, which is the smallest measurement of a libation in the Torah and is offered with a lamb...

Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi derives the gift offering of oil from a verse concerning libations: "All that are native born shall do these things in this manner, in presenting an offering made by fire" (Numbers 15:13). Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi derives from here that just as one may contribute wine libations, so too one may contribute oil. Therefore, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi compares oil to wine libations: Just as one contributes libations of three *log*, so too one contributes three *log* of oil.

ד

7 פירוש המשניות להרמב"ם פרק ד', משנה ה'

ועיקר קרבן העצים הזה, כי המשפחות המנויות היו קובעות להם לכל משפחה ומשפחה יום ידוע להביא להם עצים לאש המערכה באלו הזמנים הידועים, וביום שהיה יומם הידוע היו מקריבין קרבנות נדבה, וזהו קרבן העצים והעיתים המזומנים הכתובים בעזרא.

The idea of this 'wood sacrifice'; the enumerated families would designate days to contribute firewood. On those days they would bring voluntary sacrifices. This is the 'wood sacrifice' (mentioned in the Mishna), and the 'designated times' mentioned in 'Ezra'.

8 רמב"ם הלכות כלי המקדש פרק ו', הלכה ט'

ומהו קרבן העצים זמן קבוע היה למשפחות משפחות לצאת ליערים להביא עצים למערכה ויום שיגיע לבני משפחה זו להביא העצים היו מקריבין עולות נדבה וזהו קרבן העצים והיה להם כמו יו"ט ואסורין בו בהספד ובתענית ובעשיית מלאכה ודבר זה מנהג.

What was a sacrifice of wood? Certain families had a fixed time on which they would go out to the forests and bring wood for the arrangement [on the altar]. On the day designated for this family to bring their sacrifices, they would bring voluntary burnt offerings. This was called the sacrifice of the wood. It was like a festival for these families and they were forbidden to have eulogies delivered, fast, and perform work on that day. This was a custom

9 ריטב"א תענית כ"ו, א'

שהיו מבערי' במזבח בפני עצמו מן העצים שהתרבו [בהגהות כור לזהב: שהתנדבו] וזה היה קרבן העצים וכן אמר במסכ' תמיד ששני גזרין היו קרבין עם תמיד של בין הערבים וזה מוכיח כי קרבן עצים ממש הוא

They would burn from among the wood that was donated, and this was the 'wood sacrifice'. As mentioned in Maseches Tomid, that two logs were bright with the afternoon Tomid. This proves that it was an actual sacrifice.

(10) רש"י תענית כ"ו, א'

הכהנים והעם מתנדבים להביא עצים והיו מקריבין קרבן אותו היום ואפילו היו עצים הרבה למערכה היו אלו מתנדבין ומקריבין באלו תשעה זמנים:

The Kohanim and the common folk donate wood. And they would bring a sacrifice on that day. Even if there was a lot of wood for the pier, they would nevertheless donate (wood) and bring sacrifices, at these nine times.

(11) רש"י מגילה ה', א'

משפחות של ישראל שקבוע [ברש"י על הרי"ף: שקבעו] להם ימים בכל שנה להביא עצים למקדש לצורך המערכה ומביאין קרבן עצים עמהן

Yiddishe families which have a set time to bring wood for the pier every year and they would bring a sacrifice with it.

ה

(12) רבינו גרשום למנחות ק"ו, ב'

וקסבר ת"ק דאותן גזירין קריבין להכשר קרבנות על המערכה.

The first Tanna of our Mishna holds; these logs were bright on the pier to enable sacrifices.

(13) פיה"מ למנחות

לפי שהכרחי להביא בכל יום שני גזרין נוספים על המזבח לא פחות מכך

As no less than two logs must be bright on the Mizbeach every day.

ח

(14) ברכות י"ג, א'

תנו רבנן: קריאת שְׁמַע כְּכַתְּבָהּ, דְּבַרְי רַבִּי. וְחֻכְמִים אֹמְרִים: בְּכֹל לְשׁוֹן.

The Sages taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and the Rabbis disagreed with regard to the language in which *Shema* must be recited. This dispute serves as an introduction to a broader analysis of the question of intent: *Shema* must be recited as it

is written, in Hebrew, this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. And the Rabbis say: *Shema* may be recited in any language.

מאי טעמא דרבי? אמר קרא "וְהָיָה בְהוֹיָתוֹ יְהוָה."

The Gemara seeks to clarify: What is the reason for Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's opinion? The Gemara answers: The source for his *halakha* lies in the emphasis on the word: "And these words, which I command you this day, will be upon your heart" (Deuteronomy 6:6). "Will be" means as they are, so shall they be; they should remain unchanged, in their original language.

ורבנן, מאי טעמיהו? אמר קרא: "שְׁמַע" — בְּכָל לְשׁוֹן שְׂאֵתָה שׁוֹמֵעַ.

The Gemara seeks to clarify further: And what is the reason for the Rabbis' opinion? The Gemara answers: The source upon which the Rabbis base their opinion is, as it is stated: "Hear, Israel" (Deuteronomy 6:4), which they understand to mean that *Shema* must be understood. Therefore, one may recite *Shema* in any language that you can hear and understand.

.....

לְמִימְרָא דְסַבְר רַבִּי דְכָל הַתּוֹרָה כּוּלָּהּ בְּכָל לְשׁוֹן נֶאֱמָרָה. דְּאִי סְלִיקָא דְעֵתָךְ בְּלִשׁוֹן הַקּוּדֶשׁ נֶאֱמָרָה, "וְהָיָה" דְּכַתֵּב רַחֲמָנָא לְמָה לִּי?

The Gemara seeks to link this debate to another: Is that to say that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi holds that the entire Torah, i.e., any portion of the Torah which must be read publicly (*Tosafot*), or if one studies or reads the Torah in general (*Me'iri*), may be recited in any language? As if it should enter your mind to say that the entire Torah may only be recited in the holy tongue and not in any other, then why do I need that which the Torah wrote: "And they will be"? Prohibiting recitation of *Shema* in a language other than Hebrew is superfluous, if indeed one is prohibited from reciting any portion of the Torah in a language other than Hebrew. Since the Torah saw the need to specifically require *Shema* to be recited in Hebrew, it must be because the rest of the Torah may be recited in any language.

אִיצְטְרִיךְ מְשׁוּם דְּכַתִּיב "שְׁמַע".

The Gemara rejects this: This is not necessarily so, as the phrase: And they will be is necessary in this case because *Shema*, hear, is also written. Had it not been for the phrase: And they will be, I would have understood hear, to allow *Shema* to be recited in

any language, in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis. Therefore, and they will be, was necessary.

לְמִימְרָא דְסַבְרֵי רַבְנָן דְכָל הַתּוֹרָה כּוּלָּהּ בְּלִשׁוֹן הַקּוֹדֶשׁ נֶאֱמָרָה. דְּאִי סָלְקָא דְעֵתָךְ בְּכָל לִשׁוֹן נֶאֱמָרָה,
”שְׁמַע” דְּכֹתֵב רַחֲמֵנָא לָמָּה לִּי?!

The Gemara attempts to clarify: Is that to say that the Rabbis hold that the entire Torah may only be recited in the holy tongue and not in any other? As if it should enter your mind to say that the Torah may be recited in any language, then why do I require that which the Torah wrote: *Shema*, hear? One is permitted to recite the entire Torah in any language, rendering a specific requirement regarding *Shema* superfluous.

איצטריך משום דכתיב ”והיו”.

The Gemara rejects this: *Shema* is necessary in any case, because and they will be, is also written. Had it not been for *Shema*, I would have understood this in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, that one is prohibited from reciting *Shema* in any other language. Therefore, *Shema*, is necessary.

ט

(15) סוכה ג', א'

רַבִּי אֹמֵר: כָּל סוּכָה שֶׁאֵין בָּהּ אַרְבַּע אַמּוֹת עַל אַרְבַּע אַמּוֹת — פְּסוּלָה. וְחֻכְמִים אֹמְרִים: אֶפֶילוּ אֵינָה מְחֻזְקֶת אֶלָּא רֵאשׁוֹ וְרוּבּוֹ — כְּשֶׁרָה.

Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: Any *sukka* that does not have an area of at least four cubits by four cubits is unfit. And the Rabbis say: Even if it holds only his head and most of his body, it is fit.

(16) אמור כ"ג, מ"ב

בַּסֶּכֶת תִּשְׁבּוּ שִׁבְעַת יָמִים כָּל־הָאֶזְרָח בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל יֹשְׁבוּ בַּסֶּכֶת:

For a seven day period you shall live in booths. Every resident among the Israelites shall live in booths,

י"ד

(17) גיטין ע"ד, א'

מִתְּנִי הָרִי זֶה גִיטָךְ עַל מְנַת שְׁתַּתְּנִי לִי מֵאֵתֶיךָ זֶה הָרִי זֶה מְגוּרְשֶׁת וְתִתֶּנּוּ

MISHNA: If a husband says to his wife: This is your bill of divorce on the condition that you will give me two hundred dinars, then she is divorced and must give two hundred dinars in order to fulfill the condition of the bill of divorce...

הָא מִנֵּי רַבִּי הִיא דְאָמַר רַב הוּנָא אָמַר רַבִּי כָּל הָאוֹמֵר עַל מְנַת כְּאוֹמֵר מֵעַכְשָׁיו דְּמִי וּפְלִיגִי רַבֵּנן עֲלֵיהּ

In accordance with whose opinion is this *baraita*? It is the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. As Rav Huna says that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: Anyone who states a condition employing the language: On the condition, is like one who states: The agreement will take effect retroactively from now, even though the condition is fulfilled only later on. And the Rabbis disagree with him.

י"א

(18) סנהדרין פ"ד, א'

הִזִּיד בַּמַּעֲלָה רַבִּי אוֹמֵר בְּמִיתָהּ וְחַכְמִים אוֹמְרִים בְּאִזְהָרָה מֵאִי טַעֲמָא דְרַבִּי אִמַּר ר' אַבְהוּ גַּמַּר חֲטָא חֲטָא מִתְרוּמָה מַה לְהֵלֶן בְּמִיתָהּ אִף כֵּאֵן בְּמִיתָהּ

The *baraita* continues: With regard to one who intentionally performed an action of misuse of consecrated property. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: He is punished with death at the hand of Heaven, and the Rabbis say: He is liable only for violating a prohibition. The Gemara elaborates: What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi? Rabbi Abbahu says: He derives a verbal analogy: The meaning of the term of sin written with regard to one who intentionally misuses consecrated property (see Leviticus 5:15) is derived from the term of sin written with regard to an impure priest who partakes of *teruma* (see Leviticus 22:9). Just as there, with regard to *teruma*, the priest is punished with death at the hand of Heaven, so too here, one who intentionally misuses consecrated property is punished with death at the hand of Heaven.

ורבנן אמרי אמר קרא בו בו ולא במעילה:

The Gemara explains: And the Rabbis say that the verse states with regard to *teruma*: "Because of it" they receive death at the hand of Heaven, but not in the case of the intentional misuse of consecrated property.

י"ב

19) מנחות כ"ח, ב'

כלי שרת שעשאן של עץ רבי פוסל ורבי יוסי ברבי יהודה מכשיר במאי קא מיפלגי רבי דריש כללי ופרטי ורבי יוסי בר' יהודה דריש ריבויי ומיעוטי

Rav Yosef continued: As it is taught in a *baraita*: With regard to Temple service vessels that one fashioned from wood, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi deems them unfit and Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, deems them fit. According to this *baraita*, their dispute was with regard to a Candelabrum fashioned from wood, not from metal. Rav Yosef explains: With regard to what principle do they disagree? Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi interprets verses by means of the principle of generalizations and details, and Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, interprets verses by means of the principle of amplifications and restrictions.

רבי דריש כללי ופרטי (שמות כה, לא) ועשית מנורת כלל זהב טהור פרט מקשה תיעשה המנורה חזר וכלל כלל ופרט וכלל אי אתה דן אלא כעין הפרט מה הפרט מפורש של מתכת אף כל של מתכת

Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi interprets the verse: “And you will make a Candelabrum of pure gold; of beaten work will the Candelabrum be made” (Exodus 25:31), by means of the principle of generalizations and details. “And you will make a Candelabrum of” is a generalization, as the material of the Candelabrum is not specified; “pure gold” is a detail, limiting the material exclusively to gold; and by then stating: “Of beaten work will the Candelabrum be made,” the verse then makes a generalization. The result is a generalization and a detail and a generalization, from which you may deduce that the verse is referring only to items similar to the detail, leading to this conclusion: Just as the item mentioned in the detail is clearly defined as a type of metal, so too, all other types of metal may be used in fashioning the Candelabrum.

ר' יוסי בר' יהודה דריש ריבויי ומיעוטי ועשית מנורת ריבה זהב טהור מיעט מקשה תיעשה המנורה חזר וריבה ריבה ומיעט וריבה ריבה הכל ומאי רבי רבי כל מילי ומאי מיעט מיעט של חרס

By contrast, Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, interprets the verse by means of the principle of amplifications and restrictions. “And you will make a Candelabrum of” is an amplification, as the material of the Candelabrum is not specified; “pure gold” is a restriction, limiting the material exclusively to gold; and by then stating: “Of beaten work will the Candelabrum be made,” the verse repeated and amplified. There is a hermeneutical principle that when a verse amplified and then restricted and then

amplified, it amplified the relevant category to include everything except the specific matter excluded in the restriction. And what did the verse include? It includes all materials, even wood. And what did the verse exclude with this restriction? It excluded a Candelabrum fashioned from earthenware, which is furthest in quality from gold.

י"ג

(20) עירובין ל', ב'

הַנִּכְנָס לְאֶרֶץ הָעַמִּים בְּשִׂידָה תִּיבָה וּמִגְדָּל — רַבִּי מְטַמָּא, רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה מְטַהֵר

With regard to one who enters the land of the nations, i.e., any territory outside Eretz Yisrael, not on foot, but in a carriage, a crate, or a cupboard, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi renders him ritually impure. Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, renders him pure.

בְּמַאי קָמִיפְלֵגִי? מִרְ סָבַר אֶהְל זְרוּק לְאוֹ שְׁמִיָּה אֶהְל, וּמִרְ סָבַר אֶהְל זְרוּק שְׁמִיָּה אֶהְל

. The Gemara explains: With regard to what do they disagree? One Sage, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, holds that a moving tent is not called a tent. The principle is that only something fixed can shield against ritual impurity, but if one is situated inside a portable vessel, the vessel contracts impurity and he becomes impure along with it. And the other Sage, Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, holds that a moving tent is called a tent, and it shields the person inside from contracting ritual impurity.
