

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The sinner's Mincha (cont.)

The exchange between Tanna Kamma and R' Shimon from the Baraisa concerning their respective expositions is recorded.

Another related Baraisa is cited that presents another position about the procedure for offering the sinner's mincha for a kohen.

R' Chiya bar Abba reports that R' Yochanan challenged the exposition of R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon.

R' Abba answers R' Yochanan's challenge.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Gemara explains how Rabanan who disagree with R' Shimon explain the relevant pasuk.

2) Eating the sacrificial parts of a korban

Ravina inquires about the halacha of a kohen who eats the sacrificial parts of a korban.

R' Aharon answers that the sacrificial parts are also subject to the prohibition against eating them.

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah enumerates those minachos that are completely burned on the Altar as well as those that are given entirely to kohanim and none of it goes on the Altar.

4) The relative strength of the Altar

The Mishnah's statement that indicates that the only strength of the Altar over kohanim relates to the Mincha is unsuccessfully challenged.

The choice of words in the Mishnah is explained.

The absence of oil amongst the korbanos supports Shmuel's statement that if someone donates oil, the kometz is burned on the oil and the leftovers are consumed by the kohanim.

The Mishnah's indication that there are only two korbanos that are eaten entirely by the kohanim is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Mishnah's choice of words is explained.

5) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah describes the procedure for different varieties of Mincha.

6) Three oil applications

R' Pappa explains what is excluded by the Mishnah's emphasis that there are only three oil applications.

A Baraisa presents the sources for the three oil applications. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

The remainder of the sin minchah of the kohen is destroyed

אחיכו עליה וכי יש לך דבר שקרב לאיבוד

The Gemara cited a Baraisa which details some of the rules of a sinner's minchah of a kohen. The general rule is that any minchah brought by a kohen for his own self is totally burned, and none of it is eaten. The minchah of a sinner usually has a kemitzah taken from it, which is placed on the Altar to be burned, and the remainder (שירים) is given to the kohanim to eat. In the Baraisa we find the opinion of R' Shimon that in this case, the kemitzah is taken and burned by itself, and the remainder of the minchah is also taken by itself, and it is also burned. R' Elazar b. R' Shimon disagrees with this, and he holds that while it is true that the kemitzah is burned by itself, the remainder of the minchah is taken and spread across the pile upon which the ashes of the Altar were usually placed.

The Gemara struggles to identify which pile of ashes was referred to in this halacha. If it was the ash pile on the top of the Altar, then R' Elazar would be agreeing that the remainder of the minchah is to be burned on the Altar. And, if the pile of ashes mentioned is the pile of ashes on the floor of the courtyard near the ramp of the Altar, where the ashes of the pyre were placed each morning, this would be difficult because we have no precedent of an offering being placed directly upon this pile. R' Abba suggests that the ash pile is the one on the floor, and the procedure being described is not one where the remaining flour is being placed as part of the offering, but rather to discard it in a wasteful manner.

The members of the yeshiva scoffed at this suggestion, as we do not find an offering which is discarded in such a manner.

Rashi explains that the reaction to rebuff the suggestion of R' Abba was because it is unprecedented to find that the procedure of bringing an offering, such as the sinner's minchah of a kohen, would be designed to have a part of it discarded. The Chiddushim of Rashba elaborate and note that if an offering was designated for its purpose and a disqualification occurred later, it is obvious that the offering may have to be destroyed, but it is unthinkable that the procedure of designating the sin minchah of a kohen would be arranged to have part of it have to be destroyed. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Reciting the beracha when separating terumah nowadays
 אמר ליה ר' אבא דלמא לאיבוד

R' Abba said to him that perhaps it is to be destroyed

R' Abba suggests perhaps that the leftovers of a kohen's Minchas Chotai are thrown onto the pile of ashes taken from the top of the altar every morning that is located next to the ramp. The reaction of the Gemara to this suggestion was one of astonishment. Is there such a thing as something that is offered so that it should be destroyed rather than burned on the altar? The principle that something is not offered merely to be destroyed finds expression elsewhere. Rambam¹ addresses a person who is transporting a barrel of wine or oil and noticed that the barrel is about to break. If he was to declare the contents of the barrel as terumah and ma'aser for other produce that he has in his house, even **בדיעבד**, it is invalid. The reason, explains Tsafnas Pa'anei'ach,² is that a declaration of terumah on produce that is about to be destroyed or lost is ineffective.

Sefer Pri Ha'Adamah³ writes that nowadays the beracha should not be recited when one separates terumah. The reason is that we do not have kohanim who can prove the authenticity of their lineage and the terumah ends up going to waste. Since halacha opposes separating produce as terumah if it will be destroyed the beracha for separating terumah is not recited. Birkei Yosef⁴ challenges Sefer Pri

REVIEW and Remember

1. Who brings the korban for a kohen who sinned?

2. Why did other scholars laugh at R' Abba?

3. In what way is the right of the altar stronger than the rights of kohanim?

4. What are the three oil applications?

Ha'Adamah from the fact that we also do not give challah to kohanim nowadays and yet common practice is to recite that beracha. Birkei Yosef goes on to relate that in Yerushalayim and Chevron the custom is that a beracha is not recited when separating terumah and ma'aser from wine and as much as he inquired for an explanation for the practice he did not find one that he felt was satisfactory. He also notes that Teshuvos Avkas Rochel⁵ wrote that the practice of not reciting the beracha when separating terumah and ma'aser was not established by **ותיקין** which indicates that there is room to justify changing the common custom and teach that the beracha should be recited. ■

1. רמב"ם פ"ג מהלי תרומות הי"ז.
2. צפנת פענח פ"י מהלי מאכלות אסורות הטי"ו.
3. ספר פרי האדמה ח"ד הלי שבת דף ד.
4. ברכי יוסף יו"ד סי' של"א ס"ק כ"ג וס"ק כ"ו.
5. שו"ת אבקת רוכל סי' ד'. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Altar at the Bris

"והא איכא נסכים..."

Today's daf discusses the wine libations.

The Toras Chaim, zt"l, provides a beautiful explanation of milah and the wine that is drunk immediately after the bris is preformed. "Our sages teach that circumcising a child is likened to bringing a korban olah on the altar. This explains the custom to circumcise a baby on the northern side of the synagogue, since the olah was slaughtered in the north. It follows that the knees

of the sandak are likened to the altar. For this reason, the sandak should be the one to drink the wine since this is likened to pouring wine down the two holes in the southwest corner of the altar's base.

"Although the prevalent custom today is that the one making the blessings drinks the wine, this is an error. Instead, the sandak should hold the baby on his lap during the recital of the blessings and drink the wine himself."¹

It is important to consider carefully before choosing the sandak for one's child. A baby's sandak has an effect on the boy for the rest of his life. Once, the Chazon Ish, zt"l, was asked to be

sandak at a bris. When the grandfather—who had traveled from outside of Eretz Yisrael and was himself a prominent person—heard about this he was none too pleased. The newborn's father was himself unsure what to do, and so he went to the Chazon Ish and asked if he was willing to forgo the honor. The Chazon Ish gave a startling reply.

He said simply, "For myself, of course I am willing to forgo the honor. But for the baby's good, it would be better if I was the sandak. I am mevater, but the baby is not mevater!"² ■

1. תורת חיים עמ"ס סנהדרין, דף פ"ט
2. מעשה איש ח"ב, עמ' קכ"ב ■

