

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The minimum measurement to transgress the prohibition (cont.)

According to a second version R' Yitzchok bar Yosef related that R' Yochanan inquired whether one violates the prohibition by adding a small amount of oil and the question was left unresolved.

2) The prohibition against placing oil and frankincense on the sinner's mincha

A Baraisa further elaborates on the prohibition against adding oil or frankincense to the sinner's mincha.

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah teaches that some menachos require bringing near and waving or one or the other or neither. The Mishnah discusses those menachos that must be brought near but do not require waving.

4) Bringing near

R' Pappa notes that the Mishnah lists ten menachos that require bringing near but do not require waving and 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 is cited for the source of those menachos that must be brought near the altar. Within the Baraisa two different approaches, one from R' Shimon and the second from R' Yehudah, to expounding the verses are recorded.

The Gemara pauses momentarily to explain how R' Shimon refutes R' Yehudah's exposition and R' Yehudah's response to that exposition.

The Baraisa continues its analysis of the verses.

A point in the Baraisa is clarified. ■

REVIEW and Remember

- How many prohibitions does one violate for putting oil and frankincense on a sinner's mincha?

- What is the obligation of "bringing near"?

- Which mincha is brought from regular flour?

- What are the two lessons derived from the word והקריבה?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Multiple sins for multiple foreign additives to the minchah
יכול בשני כהנים וכו' תלמוד לומר עליה

The Baraisa clarifies the halacha that it is prohibited to add oil or frankincense to the minchah of a sinner. The verse (Vayikra 5:11) states that one may not add oil or frankincense. The Baraisa notes that we might have thought that it is only possible to be in violation of both of these prohibitions if two kohanim participate together, with one adding oil and the other adding frankincense. Therefore, the verse adds the word "עליה - upon it," which teaches us that the violation is a function of placing these additives upon the minchah. Anytime either oil or frankincense is added, a violation is in effect, even if it is done by a single kohen.

Rashi explains that the question of the Baraisa was that perhaps the only time two violations would be in effect is where two kohanim are acting, but if a single kohen added both oil and frankincense he would only be in violation of a single negative command. Tosafos (ד"ה יכול) explains that the Baraisa's understanding was that two sins can be violated only with two kohanim, one adding oil to one minchah, and the other adding frankincense to a different minchah. The reason for this understanding is that once a foreign ingredient is added to the minchah of a sinner, the minchah has been ruined, and it does not seem reasonable that a further sin could be done with adding an additional foreign substance. Therefore, the verse which lists both oil and frankincense as sinful additives must be dealing in a case where either one of these was added, but not both. According to this, multiple sins can only accrue with multiple menachos, with each minchah only being eligible to be ruined once. Tosafos notes that at this point, we do not have to be dealing with two or more kohanim who are adding these substances, because even one kohen can be in violation of multiple sins. Yet, the Baraisa illustrates a case of several kohanim because it was not common for a single kohen to perform more than one service, in order to allow many kohanim the opportunity to serve.

The conclusion of the Baraisa is that it is possible for a single kohen to be in violation of adding both oil and frankincense to a single minchah, as we learn from the term "upon it," even though the minchah becomes invalid after

Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
Mr. Chaim Fisher
In memory of his mother
מרת בת' בת ר' צבי הירש, ע"ה

HALACHAH Highlight

Bris milah and megilla reading, which comes first?

הא מצוייה טפי הנך זימנין דלא משכח לה כלל

This is more frequent since the others may never occur

Rema¹ rules that if there is a bris milah to perform on Purim the bris milah should be done before the reading of the megilla. In Darchei Moshe² he offers two explanations for this halacha. One reason is that the child should be called a Jew so that he will be included in the verse (Esther 8:9), “And the Jews had light.” Additionally, since the word “light” in the pasuk refers to Torah and the word “happiness” refers to bris milah we want to juxtapose a bris milah to Torah reading. He then notes that this ruling does not follow Terumas HaDeshen’s opinion³ that the bris milah should be performed after davening as it is on other days. Additionally, he writes that the megilla should be read before performing the bris milah since it is considered more frequent by virtue of the fact that it occurs at a fixed time every year. Radvaz⁴ also writes that megilla reading is considered more frequent than bris milah. Even though megilla reading occurs only once a year and there are many bris milahs that are done, nevertheless, a mitzvah that has a fixed time is considered more frequent than a mitzvah that could possibly never be performed.

Maharsham⁵ asserts that the principle established by Terumas HaDeshen and Radvaz that something that occurs regu-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

larly is automatically categorized as more frequent than a mitzvah that may happen more often but without a set frequency could be traced to the disagreement between R’ Yehudah and R’ Shimon in our Gemara. R’ Yehudah and R’ Shimon disagree whether the obligation to “bring close” the Minchas Omer could be derived from the מנחת חוטא and the מנחת סוטה. The essence of the dispute is that R’ Shimon considers the מנחת חוטא and מנחת סוטה more frequent since they occur more often over the course of a year whereas R’ Yehudah maintains that the Minchas Omer is more frequent since it has a fixed time that it must be offered. This is essentially a debate that revolves around Terumas HaDeshen’s and Radvaz’s principle. Since halacha follows R’ Yehudah it emerges that halacha accepts the principle of Terumas HaDeshen and Radvaz. ■

larly is automatically categorized as more frequent than a mitzvah that may happen more often but without a set frequency could be traced to the disagreement between R’ Yehudah and R’ Shimon in our Gemara. R’ Yehudah and R’ Shimon disagree whether the obligation to “bring close” the Minchas Omer could be derived from the מנחת חוטא and the מנחת סוטה. The essence of the dispute is that R’ Shimon considers the מנחת חוטא and מנחת סוטה more frequent since they occur more often over the course of a year whereas R’ Yehudah maintains that the Minchas Omer is more frequent since it has a fixed time that it must be offered. This is essentially a debate that revolves around Terumas HaDeshen’s and Radvaz’s principle. Since halacha follows R’ Yehudah it emerges that halacha accepts the principle of Terumas HaDeshen and Radvaz. ■

1. רמ"א או"ח סי' תרצ"ג סעי' ד'.
2. דרכי משה שם אות ד'.
3. שו"ת תרומת הדשן סי' רס"ו.
4. שו"ת הרדב"ז ח"א סי' רנ"א.
5. דעת תורה לאו"ח הנ"ל. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Identifying the Problem

”מה למנחת קנאות שכן באה לברר עון...”

On today’s daf we find that the minchas kenaos clears up the sin by identifying the wrongdoer absolutely or by exonerating her of suspicion. Perhaps, in its own way, this is the hardest test for every Jew: to own up when we have failed so that we can really change our ways. Rav Yaakov Galinsky, zt”l, points the challenge inherent in this with his usual biting humor. “In Novardohk they would tell a story of a certain child who was always late for cheder. Day after day this child was punished, only to be tardy yet again the following day. One day the melamed asked the boy directly. ‘Why are

you late every day?’

He answered, ‘Rebbe, my problems are that I am disorganized and forgetful. When I go to sleep each night I drop my clothes wherever and go to bed. The next morning it takes me a long time to get dressed. Is it any wonder that I come late?’

“The melamed offered practical advice. ‘All you need to do is to write a list of precisely where you dropped each article of clothing. The next morning when you wake up, consult the list and you will know exactly where you left your clothes the night before.’

“The boy went home with a lightened heart. The next day the child didn’t come at all. As soon as he was able, the melamed rushed to the young man’s house. He found the boy at his house, fully dressed but obviously very bewil-

dered.

“What happened?” he asked.

“I did exactly what you said. I wrote down that my tzitzis were in the garden, my shirt on the chair, my pants on the floor etc, I said hamapil with great joy and went to sleep. This morning I woke up and got dressed quickly but I still cannot locate the final item. It says clearly that I am in bed, but I checked my bed—and everywhere else—many times and cannot seem to find myself...”

Rav Yaakov concluded, “This is obviously a joke, but it is so sad. How many of us are looking to find ourselves but cannot seem to do so! The very first question we will be asked in the next world is, ‘Ayekah?’ Where did you go and what did you do? Where did you plant yourself and what happened with you?” ■

1. הגדה של פסח והגדת, ע' 246-247 ■