

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Multiple sets of lashes (cont.)

The Gemara continues to discuss the number of lashes one receives for eating maaser sheni of grain, wine and oil.

R' Yitzchok teaches that one who eats bread, toasted kernels and plump kernels from new grain is liable for three sets of lashes.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

The reason it was necessary for the Torah to mention each one of them is explained.

2) Gezeirah shavah

R' Yannai emphasizes the importance of a gezeirah shavah.

Three related statements are recorded, one from R' Simai, another from Abaye and the last from R' Ashi.

3) Preparing the anointing oil

A Baraisa elaborates on the prohibition related to the anointing oil.

The Gemara searches for the sources related to the exemptions from liability when preparing the anointing oil.

A statement of Rava is unsuccessfully challenged based on this discussion.

A Baraisa discusses the quantity of the different ingredients that went into the anointing oil.

The last statement of the Baraisa is explained.

R' Pappa and Abaye discuss the procedure for weighing the ingredients.

R' Yehudah's related statement is clarified.

A Baraisa presents a dispute between R' Yehudah and R' Yosi concerning the anointing oil prepared by Moshe Rabbeinu.

Another related Baraisa is cited.

The Gemara searches for the sources of the second

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

Blending the oil to learn or to provide it for the community

ללמוד בו או למוסרו לציבור פטור

One of the kareis cases in the Mishnah involves one who blends together the formula of the anointing oil described in the Torah which was made to consecrate the utensils and implements of the Mikdash. A Baraisa teaches that a person is not liable for violating this prohibition if he blends this formula in order to learn and train how to make the actual anointing oil for the Mikdash. Similarly, one is also not liable if he concocts this recipe of ingredients in order to present his finished product to the community for its use.

The text of this Baraisa as recorded by Shitta Mikubetzes is that it is presenting one case. "One is exempt if he blends the oil in order to learn how to make the anointing oil in order to give it to the community." Tosafos Yom Tov notes that the posuk which the Gemara cites as proof for this exemption is only stated in terms of "handing the oil to the community," so it is very reasonable that the exemption of making the oil "in order to learn" is not a separate category, and that it is only in conjunction with "handing it to the community."

Rambam (Hilchos Klei HaMikdash 2:10) clearly separates these exemptions into two distinct categories. He writes that this halacha applies if blending the oil is done "to learn or to provide it for the community." Tosafos Yom Tov explains that the exemption of "learning" is to be understood in terms of the oil then being available for the community. Sefer Chazon Nachum points out that it is implied from Tosafos Yom Tov that a person would be liable for kareis if he is learning how to blend the anointing oil just in order to know how to do it for personal purposes. However, this is not what is implied from the words of Rambam, who separates and seems to distinguish between the exemptions of "learning" and that of "providing the oil for the community."

Rambam (ibid. 1:4) rules that a person is exempt from kareis if he blends the anointing oil formula in order to give it to someone else. Radba"z explains that Rambam noted a discrepancy in the Baraisa. At one point we find that one is liable if he blends the oil to use it to rub on his own body. This implies that if it is formulated in order to give to someone else he is exempt. Yet, the Baraisa also mentions that one is only exempt if he makes the oil in order to give it to the community. This implies that he is liable if it is made in order to give to an individual. These are conflicting conclusions regarding making the oil to give to an individual. Therefore, Rambam explains that the one who blends it to give to others is exempt, just like one who makes the oil to give to the community. Yet, the one who accepts it is also exempt even if he uses it to rub on his body, because rubbing oil on one's body is only prohibited if one uses the oil of Moshe Rabeinu. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why was it necessary for the Torah to specify לחם קלי וקרמל separately?

2. What is the point of dispute between R' Yehudah and R' Yosi?

3. How do we know that kings from yisroel are not anointed?

4. What is the correct sequence for anointing a Kohen gadol?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
Mr. and Mrs. Moshe Appel
In loving memory of their father
ר' דב בערל בן ר' ר' יצחק ע"ה

HALACHAH Highlight

Inheriting the throne

”הוא ובניו” ירושה היא

“He and his sons” implying that it is an inheritance

R' Acha bar Yaakov derives from a pasuk that a child inherits the throne from his father. Korban Aharon¹ explains that the juxtaposition of the word **הוא** to **בניו** indicates the throne is passed directly from father to son. For that reason it is unnecessary to anoint the son who takes the throne from his father. This clearly indicates that a son inherits the throne and the son is not appointed to the throne. However, the Gemara elsewhere seems to contradict this principle. The Gemara Rosh Hashanah (2b) discusses the case of a king who dies in Adar and his son ascends the throne in Nissan. One may have thought that we should consider the son to be in the second year of his reign since the king died in Adar and the beginning of Nissan begins the next year of his reign, therefore, it is necessary to emphasize that the son's reign began its count in Nissan. This clearly indicates that a son does not automatically inherit the throne from his father. A number of resolutions to this contradiction are suggested.

Chasam Sofer² answers that our Gemara does not mean that a child automatically inherits the king's throne. The child must be examined to determine whether he is worthy of filling his father's position. If he is, then he is given the throne even if someone else is more worthy but if he is not worthy to fill his father's position it is not given to him. Therefore, in a case where the king dies in Adar we do not appoint his son to the throne immediately since it has to be determined whether he is worthy. However, if he is determined worthy he takes over that position as an inheritance.

Chasdei Dovid³ suggests that the throne is indeed a position that is automatically inherited. The reason the Gemara in Rosh Hashanah discusses delaying the appointment of the son of the king to the throne is that it refers to a circumstance in which the

Baraisa's rulings.

4) Anointing kings

The Gemara clarifies a Baraisa's statement of explanation why Yehu ben Nimshi was anointed.

The source that only kings from the Davidic dynasty are anointed is identified.

Statements related to anointing particular kings are clarified.

Rebbi's earlier statement regarding the intent of a pasuk in Divrei HaYamim is unsuccessfully challenged.

Another Baraisa supports Rebbi's explanation of that pasuk.

The assertion that the anointing oil was around during the time of Yehoachaz is unsuccessfully challenged.

5) Anointing

A Baraisa describes the procedure for anointing kings and kohanim.

It is noted that there is a dispute regarding the sequence of anointing a Kohen Gadol.

The second opinion is unsuccessfully challenged.

Tangentially, a Baraisa describes Moshe Rabbeinu's anointing of Aharon.

Another Baraisa discusses anointing kings.

6) Good omens

R' Ami describes what one should do to determine whether he will live out the year. ■

king left behind many sons and it must be determined which of the sons will take over the throne. When there are different sons interested in the throne and an appointment is not made until Nissan his reign is not counted retroactively from Adar; rather it is counted from Nissan when he was chosen ahead of his other brothers. ■

1. קרבן אהרן למכילתא דמילואים אות ט'

2. שו"ת חת"ס או"ח סי' י"ב.

3. חסדי דוד לתוספתא ר"ה פ"א ה"א. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Anointing Our King

אין מושכין את המלכים אלא על המעיין

The author of Siddur Otzar HatTefillos explains why we do tashlich on Rosh HaShanah from a statement on today's daf. “Rav Saadiya Gaon explains that we blow the shofar on Rosh HaShanah because on that day we declare Him as king of the world. We blow shofar to accept His kingship over us. As the verse states, ‘בחצוצרות וקול שופר הרעו לפני המלך ה’.

This is also why we go to the river or another water source to do tashlich on Rosh HaShanah. As we find in Kareisos 5, we only anoint a king near a body of water. Similarly, on Rosh HaShanah, the day we renew our acceptance of God's kingship, we re-anoint Him as it were by a river.¹

The Magid Devarav L'Yaakov, zt"l, explains in a similar vein why we don't do tashlich on Rosh Hashanah which falls on Shabbos. “Tashlich is a kind of anointment of God as king. We find in Kareisos 5 that we only anoint a king when there are enemies to his becoming king. But if no one

objects to his becoming king, there is no need to anoint. When Rosh Hashanah falls out during the week, one must contend with many enemies which try to trip him up, making it very difficult to declare God's kingship with a full heart. We therefore must go to a water source and anoint Him there. In this manner we silence all accusers. On Shabbos, however, the Zohar tells us that there are no accusers—at least compared with during the week. It follows that there is no need to anoint God king.”² ■

1. סידור אוצר התפילות, סדר תשל"ך

2. מגיד דבריו ליעקב, ע' קי"ב ■