



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) A non-kohen pouring the oil of the Mincha (cont.)

The Gemara's initial understanding of R' Shimon's position disqualifying a minchah if a non-kohen poured the oil is rejected and an alternative explanation for R' Shimon's position suggested.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

### 2) The Torah's use of the words תורה and חוקה

Rav states that when the Torah uses the term תורה or חוקה it is to indicate that the law under discussion is essential.

The Gemara's initial understanding is that both terms must be present for the law to be essential.

On the fourth attempt to refute this principle the Gemara succeeds and decides that the appearance of either word is sufficient to make the law essential.

This principle is also challenged and the Gemara states that only the word חוקה makes a law essential and Rav's original statement is revised to reflect this position.

The assumption that the term חוקה indicates that a law is essential is unsuccessfully challenged.

### 3) Repetitions

Rav stated that any time the Torah repeats itself in the context of the minchah it is to teach that the law is essential but Shmuel maintains that only the ground flour and oil are essential.

Shmuel's statement is challenged and consequently revised and a new explanation of the dispute between Rav and Shmuel is suggested.

The assumption that according to Shmuel we do not derive the halachos for generations from a halacha which applied once is unsuccessfully challenged.

Rav's position that repetitions indicate something is essential is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Ashi clarifies the end of the Baraisa that was cited.

R' Huna poses another challenge to Rav's assertion that repetitions indicate that something is essential. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Does the slaughtering of a korban have to be done by the owner?

2. How does the Torah hint at what is essential in a minchah?

3. According to Shmuel, what is essential for a minchah?

4. To which side of the altar is the minchah brought?

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Making a utensil with which to collect the kemitzah

שלא יעשה מדה לקומץ

The Baraisa contrasts two verses. One verse (Vayikra 2:2) says that the kohen should "take his entire kometz." Another verse (Vayikra 6:8) reports that the kohen must "remove the kometz with his hand." These verses teach that the kohen must take the kometz with his hands, and that he may not collect it with a utensil. Rav and Shmuel agree with this halacha, but they disagree whether collecting the kometz with a utensil would ruin the service. Rav understands that the Torah repeats this halacha, in order to teach that it is critical. Shmuel contends that the reference where the Torah repeats this is in the context of a one-time event, the day the Mishkan was initiated, and we cannot use that verse as an indication of halacha for future generations. Accordingly, we have only one verse teaching this halacha, so it is not critical.

Rashi explains that the fashioning of a utensil for the kometz means that we would make a utensil which precisely matches the volume of flour which fits in the kohen's hand, and we would collect the flour from the minchah with it. Tosafos Yeshanim (to Yoma 47a) cites the view of Rashbam who says that there is no question that all opinions require that the kometz be taken by hand. The clear implication of the word "וקמץ" is an act which is done with the hand. Rather, the Gemara's suggestion is that we might have said that the kometz of flour may be measured with a tool or utensil, and that volume of flour should be placed on the top of the minchah flour. The kohen would then collect that pre-measured amount by hand. This is the case where Rav and Shmuel agree that it should not be done, but if it was done, Shmuel says it is kosher, but Rav disqualifies it.

Gevuros Ari (ibid.) questions this explanation of Rashbam. Rav cites the verse in Parashas Shemini (Vayikra 9:17) regarding the initiation of the Mishkan, from where we learn that collecting the kometz by hand is critical and that using a utensil is unacceptable. The Torah says, "And he filled his hands with it (the minchah)." Where do we see any indication that the kometz of minchah was not pre-

(Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 לע"נ חנה בת יהודה  
 from the Axselrud family

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Remuneration for slaughtering

מכלל דשחיטה בעלמא לא בעינן בעלים

This implies that generally slaughtering a korban does not have to be done by the owner

The Gemara derives from the fact that the Kohen Gadol was obligated to slaughter his bull on Yom Kippur that generally the owner of a korban is not obligated to slaughter his own korban. Rashi<sup>1</sup> explains that the reason blemished kohanim received a portion of the korbanos was that they would remove worms from the wood in addition to slaughtering, skinning the animals, and dismembering animals. This clearly indicates that common custom was that the owner did not slaughter his own korban and the task was assigned to blemished kohanim who were unfit for other parts of the service.

Teshuvos Beis Yitzchok<sup>2</sup> proves from this comment of Rashi that a slaughterer is permitted to receive payment for slaughtering. This is an important point since Da'as Kedoshim<sup>3</sup> rules that a slaughterer is not allowed to take payment for slaughtering. He bases his position on the Gemara Nedarim (37a) that teaches that just as God taught us the Torah for free so too we are expected to teach and fulfill mitzvos for free. Included in this, asserts Da'as Kedoshim, is the obligation to slaughter without receiving remuneration. Clearly this is not the case, concludes Beis Yitzchok, since it is evident from Rashi that the blemished kohanim

(Insight...continued from page 1)  
-measured with a utensil? As long as it is now collected by hand it should be acceptable. Gevuros Ari also points out that according to Rashbam, once the kometz volume would be measured with a utensil. it would then be returned to the minchah pile to be retaken by hand. If the measured flour is in contact with the pile, the original measurement would be cancelled, and collecting it by hand should certainly be permitted. If the measured flour is somehow separate from the pile, the kohen's retaking of the kometz has no value, as the kemitzah must be done from the minchah pile. ■

were paid for slaughtering korbanos.

Teshuvos Chesed Yehoshua<sup>4</sup> further explained based on a comment of Ketzos HaChoshen. Ketzos HaChoshen<sup>5</sup> writes that the priestly gifts are a type of payment the kohanim receive for their service in the Beis HaMikdash. Yad Ephraim<sup>6</sup> challenges this assertion from the fact that even blemished kohanim receive priestly gifts even though they are unfit to serve in the Beis HaMikdash. Chesed Yehoshua explains that in light of Rashi's comments the position of Ketzos HaChoshen is clear. Since the blemished kohanim slaughtered the sacrificial animals they also earned a portion of the priestly gifts for the service they provided. ■

1. רש"י קידושין נ"ג. ד"ה אפי בעל מום.
2. שו"ת בית יצחק יו"ד ח"א סי' ל"ד.
3. דעת קדושים יו"ד סי' א' סק"ב ד"ה נלע"ד שכמ"ש.
4. שו"ת חסד יהושע ח"א סי' ל"ב.
5. קצות החושן סי' רמ"ג סק"ד.
6. יד אפרים סי' ס"א. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## Reward is Commensurate with Effort

"שלא יעשה מדה לקומץ..."

It is surely significant that specifically the minchah sacrifice, most often brought by the poor, must be done through kemitzah, one of the hardest melachos in the Mikdash. Similarly, a bird offering must be brought with melikah, also one of the most difficult avodos. Rav Zalman Sorotzkin, zt"l, explains why.

He said, "It is good for a poor person who is forced due to financial con-

straint to bring a korban minchah that it should at least involve elements that are very difficult to do. This can be understood in light of the famous statement of our sages, 'לפום צערא אגרא' - reward is commensurate with the effort.'

"Our sages also say in Toras Kohanim on the verse, 'אזכרתה לה' that the minchah is remembered through its kemitzah and its levonah. Clearly, the kemitzah makes an impression on high specifically because it is a difficult avodah. Hashem in His kindness allows the poor man the satisfaction of knowing that a difficult ritual must be completed specifically for his sacrifice.

This may also be why we do melikah specifically for a bird offering which is also often offered by a poor man."

He continued, "The wealthy man can feel satisfied with his rich offering, but what does the poor man have to feel fulfillment in his sacrifice? The effort the kohein puts in counts towards the sacrifice and makes it important as well in Hashem's eyes. This works especially well according to the opinion that the kohein is also the messenger of the one bringing the sacrifice."<sup>1</sup> ■

1. אזנים לתורה, ו' ח'. ■