



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Prioritizing the Tamid and Musaf

The Gemara responds to Ravina's challenge regarding the number of lambs that were required to be in the pen that were already examined and could be used for the Tamid.

Support for this interpretation is presented.

2) Inauguration

The Gemara explains why the Mishnah mentioned the issue of inaugurating different Beis HaMikdash objects.

A Baraisa is cited for the source that the outer altar may not be inaugurated with the afternoon Tamid.

Two points in the Baraisa are clarified.

A contradiction is noted between our Mishnah and a Baraisa whether the gold altar is inaugurated with the morning or afternoon incense.

The Gemara responds that the matter is subject to a debate between Tannaim.

Abaye explains the rationale behind the Mishnah's position that burning of the incense in the afternoon is what inaugurates the golden altar.

The Gemara explains the rationale behind the Baraisa's position that the burning of the incense in the morning is what inaugurates the golden altar.

The Mishnah's statement regarding the inauguration of the table is explained.

Support for this explanation is presented.

3) Incense

A Baraisa discusses an incident in which incense was of-

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the source that the outer altar is inaugurated with the bringing of the morning Tamid?

2. When was incense burned on the outer altar?

3. When does the Kohen Gadol offer the chavitin?

4. What are the two opinions regarding the preparation of the chavitin?

Distinctive INSIGHT

The daily minchas chavitim of the kohen gadol

חביתני כהן גדול לא היו באין חצאין

The Torah commands (Vayikra 6:13) that the kohen gadol bring a minchah every day, half in the morning and half in the evening. It is called a "minchas chavitin" because it is prepared in a flat pan which is called a "machavas". Rambam (Hilchos T'midin u'Musafin 3:18) explains that one half of this minchah is brought with the tamid offering in the morning, and the other half is brought in the afternoon with the afternoon tamid. In Hilchos Ma'asei HaKorbanos (13:4), Rambam describes that this mincha was made into twelve loaves, and each was broken into half. In the morning twelve halves were offered, and twelve halves were later offered in the afternoon. Ra'aved disagrees, and he finds Rambam's explanation to be unfounded. Rather, he understands that six whole loaves were offered each morning, and six were offered each afternoon.

Was this offering of the kohen gadol considered a communal offering, representing the entire nation, or was this offering of the kohen gadol an offering of an individual? There are several practical differences between these views. One is whether it was allowed for this offering to be brought on a private altar, a bamah, during the time such arrangements were permitted. We only find that offerings of individuals were permitted on a bamah, but not communal offerings. Another practical difference would be if it would be permitted for the kohen gadol to bring his minchas chavitim after the tamid of the afternoon was already offered. We know that no offering may be brought after the tamid (Pesachim 58b). Nevertheless, Tosafos in Rosh HaShana (30b) writes that if the musaf had not been brought at its proper time before the tamid, it may be brought even afterwards. This is because the positive mitzvah for the community to bring its offering defers the positive command (השלמה) that the tamid of the afternoon be the last offering brought each day. Here, too, if the kohen had not brought his mincha on time, if it was a communal offering it would be allowed to be brought afterwards.

In Yoma (50a) and Temura (14a), R' Meir states that this mincha of the kohen gadol is an offering of an individual. Yet, Keren Orah still notes that this could only mean that it is brought from the private funds of the kohen. It may still not be his personal obligation to bring, but rather a communal responsibility that it be brought, and it is the kohen who discharges this obligation. Or Sameach (to Korban Pesach 1:3) explains that this issue may hinge upon the disagreement in the Mishnah (51b) when a kohen dies after bringing the first half of this mincha. R' Shimon says the mincha should be paid for with communal funds, and R' Yehuda says it should be paid for by the kohen's heirs. R' Shimon holds it is a communal offering, while R' Yehuda contends that it is an offering of an individual. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 In appreciation to our Rosh Kollel Rabbi Wurzbarger shlita
 for all you do from the Kollel Beth Hatalmud
 Dr Lanzer -Melbourne Australia

HALACHAH Highlight

Honoring the same person to serve as sandek

דכיון דלא שכחא ומעתרא

Since it is not common and brings wealth

The Gemara teaches that burning the incense would cause a kohen to become wealthy and Rashi¹ makes reference to the Gemara in Yoma (26a) that teaches that kohanim would not burn incense more than once because they wanted to give as many kohanim as possible the privilege of this opportunity. Maharil² cites Rabbeinu Peretz who wrote that the custom is not to honor the same person more than once with being the sandek for one's sons. The reason is that a bris is similar to the burning of the incense and the legs of the sandek parallel the altar. Consequently, just as burning the incense would cause a person to become wealthy so too serving as a sandek causes one to become wealthy. Therefore, one who honored someone to be the sandek for one son should not honor him to be the sandek for another son similar to the enactment of the Beis HaMikdash that the same person would not burn the incense twice.

Noda BiYehudah³ questions the parallel drawn between bris milah and the burning of the incense. It would seem that the more logical parallel would be between bris milah and the outer altar used for animal korbanos. In that way the blood of the bris would parallel the blood applied to the altar. He then suggests that the parallel to the incense must be based on the Midrash⁴ that describes what happened when Avrohom Avinu circumcised the members of his household. The Midrash relates that the foreskins were piled up and a stench began to emanate from them and that smell rose before Hashem and was found appealing similar to the burning incense. Even

(Overview...continued from page 1)

ferred on the outer altar rather than the inner, gold altar.

R' Pappa gives an example when such an incident occurred.

Another Baraisa is cited that unsuccessfully challenges the inference drawn from the first Baraisa.

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the chavitin offering of the Kohen Gadol.

5) The chavitin of the Kohen Gadol

A Baraisa identifies the sources for the Mishnah's statements.

Someone cited a Baraisa that teaches that the two unoffered halves are left out overnight and then burned.

R' Nachman challenged one of the statements of the Baraisa.

Two responses to this challenge are recorded.

Amoraim disagree about how the chavitin was prepared.

It is noted that Tannaim disagree about the same point.

A Mishnah is cited that teaches that the chavitin could be prepared on Shabbos.

R' Huna provides the source for this ruling.

R' Yosef challenges this derivation and another source for this halacha is presented. ■

though he discovered what he felt was the source for this parallel he writes that matters that cannot be traced to the Gemara and are based on exposition are not essential. He also notes that there are many regions and places where this custom is not observed including Prague where some people observed the custom whereas others did not. ■

1. רש"י ד"ה דלא.

2. מהרי"ל ה"ל מילה.

3. שו"ת נודע ביהודה מהדו"ק יו"ד סי' פ"ו.

4. ילקוט שמעוני בראשית רמז פ"א. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Power of the Shabbos Table

"דחינוך וקידוש של שלחן בשבת הוא..."

On today's daf we find two important halachos regarding the shulchan. Firstly, the shulchan may only be inaugurated on Shabbos. In addition, the showbreads are also only sanctified if they are placed on the shulchan on Shabbos.

Rav Shmuel Aharon Lider, shlit"a, learns a beautiful lesson from this. "We

see from this that Shabbos is the time for us to sanctify and educate our children at the table. The best way to be mechanech and sanctify our children is through the zemiros that we sing and the divrei Torah that we say at the Shabbos table."

Rav Shach, zt"l, had a neighbor—a simple baal habayis who was not too learned—whose sons grew to all be exceptional masmidim and great talmidei chachamim. Rav Shach himself lived and breathed Torah all the time, yet his neighbor's children appeared to surpass his own in certain ways as far as Torah study was concerned.

Rav Shach himself commented on what seemed to him at the root of the distinction. "My neighbor spent a long time at the Shabbos table interacting with his children and singing zemiros. I, on the other hand, was always very engrossed in working through a difficult Rambam or some other intricate Torah argument. One should never underestimate the power of filling the children with a spirit of holiness through the simple singing of zemiros and speaking divrei Torah at their own level at the Shabbos table!"¹ ■

1. כן שמעתי מדוד רב שמחה ליב גולשבסקי, ז"ל