



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The manner of burning (cont.)

The Gemara continues the question of whether placing the limbs of a korban next to the pyre is a normal manner of burning a korban and the matter is left unresolved.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses which individual parts of a Mincha are essential to the success of the korban.

3) The sources

The Gemara identifies the sources for the individual components that the Mishnah identified as essential.

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah identifies what are essential components of many other korbanos.

5) The sources

The Gemara identifies the sources for the individual components that the Mishnah identified as essential.

6) Lulav

R' Chanan bar Rava asserts that the four species of the lulav are essential only when one is missing but when all are present it is unnecessary for one to take all four.

The assertion that one is not required to take all four species is challenged.

The Gemara answers that the issue is subject to debate

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. Explain הקומץ מיעוטו מעכב את רובו.
2. What is the basis of the dispute whether a lulav must be bundled?
3. What is the point of dispute between R' Yehudah and Rabanan?
4. How do we know that the term פני refers to the East?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Dr. and Mrs. Merrill Zahrtz
In loving memory of their father
ר' חיים אלטער בן ר' יחזקאל, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
Today's Daf Digest is dedicated (in Hebrew)
לזכר נשמת הרב נתן בן החבר מנחם
the Magid Shiur of the MTJ Daf Yomi Shiur for many years
and who was my Rebbi muvhak for over 50 years.
Mr. Aaron Katz

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
לעילוי נשמת דבורה בת יוסף מאניס ע"ה
From the Rimel family, Neve Tzuf, Israel

Distinctive INSIGHT

Deficient oil for a regular minchah and for minchas nesachim
השמן מיעוטו מעכב את רובו. עשרון מיעוטו מעכב את רובו

The Mishnah teaches several lessons regarding situations where lacking even the smallest amount of an item can critically affect a particular procedure. One of the examples is regarding the oil of a minchah. Here, if even a small amount of the prescribed amount of oil is missing, the remaining amount, no matter how much there is left, is not sufficient to be used.

The Gemara explains that the Mishnah is referring both to the law of the oil of a voluntary minchah, and to the oil for the minchas nesachim which accompanies an olah or shelemim. These halachos are each learned from verses. Regarding a voluntary minchah, the verse states (Vayikra 2:2) that the minchah shall have "from its oil." In reference to the minchas nesachim, the verse states (Bemidbar 15:11) that the wine and flour which accompany a minchah must be done "ככה—thus." This teaches that the amount of oil is critical, and none of it can be lacking.

Tosafos (44b, ד"ה הסלת) notes that the Gemara seems to require two separate verses to teach the rule that oil cannot be deficient, one referring to a regular voluntary minchah and the other regarding minchas nesachim. Yet, the next halacha of the Mishnah is that the oil and the flour of a minchah are critical for each other. In other words, if either the oil or the flour is missing from a minchah, it is not valid. Once again, this halacha applies both to a voluntary minchah and to minchas nesachim. Yet, as a source for this halacha, the Gemara only furnishes a single set of verses (Vayikra 2:2 and 2:16), which teaches that this halacha applies for a voluntary minchah. How, then, do we know that the oil and flour are critical in reference to minchas nesachim? Tosafos answers that after the Torah reveals to us that the law of a regular minchah and that of minchas nesachim are the same regarding their oil, and that it may not be deficient, we then know that all menachos share the same law in other areas as well, such as in regard to the flour and oil being critical for each other.

The Gri"z offers a different approach to answer the question of Tosafos. It is only in regard to the law of the oil being deficient that we need two verses to teach this halacha in reference to a regular minchah and minchas nesachim, because the amount of oil in each case is different. A voluntary minchah needs a log of oil for an isaron of flour, whereas a minchas nesachim of a sheep needs three log of oil for an isaron of oil. We would not be able to learn the law of deficient oil from one case to the next. However, regarding the law of the flour and oil being critical for each other there would be no reason to distinguish between the guidelines of a regular minchah and that of minchas nesachim. There, we can learn them both from one set of verses. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Including sinners in the Yom Kippur prayers

וכן ישראל בהרצאה עד שיהו כולן באגודה אחת

And so too when the Jewish People seek appeasement they are not answered unless they merge together into a single unit

The Gemara teaches that when the Jewish people fast they are not answered until they merge together into a single unit. A similar thought was expressed by R' Shimon Chasida in Kereisos (6b) where he stated that any fast that does not include Jewish sinners is not a fast. Proof to this is the fact that the *chelbana* produces a foul smell and nevertheless it is one of the spices in the Ketores. Shulchan Aruch¹ writes that on Yom Kippur the custom is for the sh'liach tzibbur to formally ask permission from Heaven and the congregation to pray together with the sinners. Tur² explains that this practice is based on the thoughts recorded in our Gemara and the Gemara in Kereisos.

Bach³ explains that this declaration is nothing more than a notice to explain to people who would otherwise be surprised that sinners have joined the prayers. To answer their surprise we tell them that even the Heavenly Court granted permission for the sinners to pray with the congregation. The source that the Heavenly Court agrees with their presence is the statement of R' Shimon Chasida. Once the Heavenly court has granted permission each local court also permits prayers to take place together with sinners. Since this declaration is a notice rather than actually asking permission the wording of the declaration should be changed. It should read that the Yeshiva in Heaven and below permit praying together with the sinners with the agreement of the Omnipresent and the congregation. Furthermore, since it is

between Tannaim.

The rationale for each opinion is explained.

A Baraisa is cited and the Gemara identifies its author.

7) The sources (cont.)

The Gemara continues to identify the sources for the individual components that the Mishnah identified as essential.

8) Sprinklings of the parah adumah

A contradiction is noted whether sprinkling the blood of the parah adumah that is not directed towards the entrance of the Sanctuary is valid.

R' Chisda answers by differentiating between the position of R' Yehudah and the position of Rabanan.

The Gemara elaborates on the point of dispute and records the exchange between these two positions.

R' Yosef unsuccessfully challenges the parallel drawn between the contradictory Beraisos and the dispute between R' Yehudah and Rabanan.

Rava offers another resolution of the contradictory Beraisos. ■

(Overview...continued from page 1)

a mere notice to the congregation it is unnecessary for three people to stand together as a beis din for the declaration.

Elya Rabba⁴ notes that according to the formulation of Shulchan Aruch we are actually giving permission to pray together with the sinners, therefore, it is necessary for three people to stand together as a Beis Din to issue this permit. ■

1. שו"ע או"ח סי' תרי"ט סעי' א'
2. טור שם.
3. ב"ח שם.
4. א"ר שם סק"ד. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Four Species

"ד' מינים שבלולב..."

The Olelos Efraim, zt"l, teaches a very cutting lesson, "In Menachos 27 we find that two of the four species bear fruit, while the other two do not. Yet each pair requires the other since it is only when all are united that Hashem hears our prayers. Our sages famously explain that the esrog represents a person with both Torah and mitzvos. The lulav symbolizes a scholar who only has Torah but not mitzvos. The myrtle branches allude to one who has mitzvos, while the bitter willow represents one who has neither mitzvos nor Torah.

"It is certainly significant that the

smallest of the four species is the esrog. Although the tzaddikim are the most accomplished of the groups they diminish themselves and act like they are the most insignificant of all. Conversely, the lulav who alludes to one who learns Torah for ulterior motives must be the highest of the four. This is the way of scholars who learn for personal considerations: they place themselves above all others. This is only natural since they are filled with arrogance due to their proficiency in learning!"¹

But the Imrei Emes, zt"l, imparted a positive message from this Gemara. "We find in Menachos 27 that two of the species come from fruit-bearing trees while two do not, yet each pair requires the other. Famously our sages teach that each of the four species alludes to a different type of Jew, from the best to the worst. Never-

theless, through the mitzvos of taking the four species, each of the different groups attains a special grace. We can learn this from the halachah that all four need to be mehudarim. This is because every Jew has a special mission which only he can achieve. This is as we find in Tosafos in Chagigah, even the markedly disabled have a special grace and charm.

"This is why after being bound to the other groups the aravah is taken alone. This is to drive home the message that even the aravah Jew—the one who lacks both Torah and mitzvos—develops a unique grace of his own after taking the four species."² ■

1. אבן שלמה, ח"ד, ע' כ"ד
2. אמרי אמת, הושענא רבה, תרע"ד ■