

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah enumerates which menachos require both oil and frankincense, one, or the other or neither.

### 2) Clarifying the Mishnah

R' Pappa notes that the Mishnah begins with a list of ten menachos that require oil and frankincense. This statement is intended to exclude R' Shimon's position that one could fulfill his obligation to bring an oven baked mincha comprising half loaves and half wafers.

A Baraisa provides the sources for a number of the rulings in the Mishnah.

The exposition that taught that the lechem hapanim does not require oil is unsuccessfully challenged.

The exposition that taught that the Minchas Nesachim does not require frankincense is unsuccessfully challenged.

The exposition of the word מנחה to teach that the mincha on the eighth day of inauguration requires frankincense is unsuccessfully challenged.

The exposition of the word הוא to teach that the two loaves do not require oil or frankincense is unsuccessfully challenged.

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the parameters of the prohibition against adding oil or frankincense to the sinner's mincha or the jealousy mincha.

### 4) Adding oil or frankincense

A Baraisa provides the sources that once oil is added the korban is invalidated but if frankincense is added the only requirement is that it be removed.

Rabbah bar R' Huna asks about the halacha if ground frankincense is added, which cannot be removed.

After two unsuccessful attempts the Gemara proves from a Baraisa that the mincha is invalid until the frankincense is removed.

The Baraisa's ruling that improper intent invalidates a mincha before frankincense is removed is questioned.

Abaye, Rava and R' Ashi suggest different answers to this inquiry.

### 5) The minimum measurement to transgress the prohibition

R' Yitzchok bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan teaches how much oil and how much of the mincha are necessary to violate the prohibition.

R' Yitzchok bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan teaches how much frankincense and how much mincha are necessary to violate the prohibition. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Placing oil or frankincense on the minchah of a sinner*

וְחַיִּיב עַל הַשֶּׁמֶן בְּפָנֵי עֲצֻמוֹ חַיִּיב עַל הַלְבוֹנָה בְּפָנֵי עֲצֻמָּה

The Mishnah teaches that the verse (Vayikra 5:11) lists a separate prohibition for adding either oil or frankincense to the minchah of a sinner. Keren Orah notes that these two prohibitions are clearly listed as being separate, so the novelty of the statement of the Mishnah needs to be clarified.

He explains that we might have thought that adding oil or frankincense to the minchah of a sinner are two components of a single negative commandment, but the Torah expressed the two aspects of this violation in two phrases because the amounts required for the law of adding oil or frankincense are different. One is liable for adding even the smallest amount of oil, but adding frankincense is only liable when a full k'zayis is added. This is why the Mishnah teaches that these two laws are two separate prohibitions, and not two aspects of a single violation.

The simple reading of the verse indicates that one has violated this law as soon as he places oil or frankincense upon the minchah, and not when they are placed on the fire of the Altar. However, Rambam (Hilchos Ma'asei HaKorbanos 12:8) writes that one is liable only after having placed either oil or frankincense upon the minchah and then placing it upon the fire of the Altar ("נתן והקריב"). Sfās Emes questions where Rambam derived his ruling that the violation of this law entails placing the blended minchah upon the Altar. Sfās Emes notes that Rambam's ruling is understandable in regard to adding frankincense, because as long as the minchah has not been placed upon the fire the frankincense can be removed from the minchah. When the kometz is burned the situation is irreversible and the viola-

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the source that lechem hapanim does not require oil?

2. What halachos are derived from the word נפש?

3. Does the addition of frankincense when not mandated invalidate the Mincha?

4. What halacha is derived from the phrase לֹא יִשִּׂים?

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Fulfilling a mitzvah while violating a prohibition

”לא ישים עליה שמן” ואם שם פסול

“Do not place upon it oil” and if one did it is invalid

**S**hulchan Aruch<sup>1</sup> rules that if one davened in a place where there may be excrement without confirming that the area was clean and after davening he discovers that there was excrement in his vicinity he must daven again. Nishmas Adam<sup>2</sup> wonders whether the obligation to daven a second time is a Biblical obligation or Rabbinic. Do we say that one who violates the Torah’s instruction to not do something is not credited with performing that mitzvah, or perhaps he is credited with the mitzvah despite his sin and it is the Rabbis that obligate him to repeat the mitzvah. An application of this question is the case of one who recited Birkas HaMazon in a place where there may be excrement. Shulchan Aruch<sup>3</sup> cites different opinions about the halacha in this case and Elya Rabba<sup>4</sup> references authorities who rule that since Birkas HaMazon is a Biblical obligation one must be stringent and repeat Birkas HaMazon. Nishmas Adam asserts that this matter depends upon this question. If Biblically the mitzvah was fulfilled and it is only Rabbinically that one is obligated to repeat Birkas HaMazon the matter is a safek d’rabanan and one would not repeat Birkas HaMazon. If, however, the mitzvah was Biblically not fulfilled then one would repeat Birkas HaMazon since the matter is a safek d’oraisa.

Mishnah Lamelech<sup>5</sup> discusses the issue of whether one fulfils a mitzvah while violating a prohibition and cites our Gemara as proof that the mitzvah is not fulfilled. The phrase **לא ישים שמן** – You should not place oil – teaches that one may not place oil on the sinner’s mincha and if it is placed

(Insight...continued from page 1)

tion is finalized. However, when adding oil, liability should apparently be assigned as soon as it is added, even before it is burned.

Or Sameach points out that in Sefer HaMitzvos (Negative Command #104), Rambam discusses the minchah of a sotah, which is also a minchah of a sinner which should not have oil mixed in it. Here, too, he writes that one has violated a prohibition if he adds oil and burns the minchah. Furthermore, Rambam changes his expression when he writes (ibid. #102) that mere placing oil on a minchah of a sinner is in violation of the mitzvah. This is unlike his ruling in Mishneh Torah, where Rambam adds that burning the kometz with the oil is necessary for violation of the Torah’s command. In Sefer HaMitzvos, Rambam also makes a distinction regarding burning the minchah with frankincense upon it (distinguishing between the minchah of a sinner and the minchah of a sotah), whereas he writes that it is the placing of frankincense upon the minchah of a sotah that is the issue. Or Sameach writes that Rambam was concise in his words regarding sotah, and there also it is the burning that is the issue, not just placing the frankincense. ■

onto the sinner’s mincha the korban is invalid. Although the Torah also states **לא יתן לבונה** – do not place frankincense – nevertheless since the Torah calls it a chattas it teaches that even if frankincense was added it remains valid. This indicates that were it not for this special exposition, the mincha would be invalid just due to the virtue of the fact that it was fulfilled while violating a related prohibition. ■

1. שרייע אוי"ח סיי עייז סעי ח'.
2. נשמת אדם כלל גי סקייז.
3. שרייע אוי"ח סיי קפ"ה סעי ה'.
4. אליה רבה שם סקיי"ה.
5. משנה למלך פ"א מהלי קרבן פסח ה"ה. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The Oil of Good Deeds

”לחם הפנים טעון לבונה ואין טעון שמן...”

**T**he Avnei Nezer, zt”l, once explained a law that we find on today’s daf. “Our sages tell us that oil lends splendor to a sacrifice. For this reason there is no oil in the sacrifice of a sotah. Clearly lacking oil is a sign of a lack of completion in the sacrifice. It therefore seems difficult that there is no oil added to the showbread, as we find in the

Mishnah in Menachos 59.

“We can answer this apparent difficulty by considering the words of the Midrash regarding the oil included in a minchah offering. The Midrash explains that a minchah is mixed with oil because Torah must be mixed with good deeds.<sup>1</sup> The fine flour of the minchah represents Torah since the Torah acts as a sifter for us since it clarifies to us what is good and what is not.

“In light of this we can understand why the showbread did not require oil. The lechem hapanim was a sacrifice that

was brought on Shabbos. It didn’t require oil—which alludes to good deeds—because Shabbos is a day of rest, not primarily of action. The proof of this is the Tanna D’vei Eliyahu which writes that one should make Shabbos a day that is entirely Torah.<sup>2</sup> Our main task on Shabbos is to delve deeper and deeper into Torah. It follows that the oil of good deeds would have been superfluous for the lechem hapanim.”<sup>3</sup> ■

1. ויקרא רבה, ג' ז'.
2. תנא דבי אליהו רבה, פ"א
3. נאות הדשא, ח"א, ע' צ"א ■