

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Frequent and sacred (cont.)

Numerous unsuccessful attempts are made to resolve the question of whether that which is frequent takes precedence or that which is sacred.

Rava's distinction between frequent and prevalent is unsuccessfully challenged.

2) Frequent

The Gemara inquires about what should be done procedurally if one slaughtered the infrequent korban first.

Numerous unsuccessful attempts to resolve this matter are recorded.

3) Eating a korban

The reason kohanim may prepare a korban in any manner that they choose is explained.

4) MISHNAH: The Mishnah explains the origin of oil that is distributed to kohanim in the Azarah and the origin of oil that is poured on the fires of the altar.

5) Oil offerings

Shmuel describes the procedure for oil offerings according to R' Tarfon.

R' Zeira suggests support for this explanation from the Mishnah.

Abaye challenges R' Zeira from the latter part of the Baraisa.

The Gemara explains how Abaye and R' Zeira respectively explain the part of the Mishnah that is inconsistent with their position.

An unsuccessful challenge to Shmuel's explanation is recorded.

It is suggested that Shmuel's explanation is subject to a dispute between Tannaim.

R' Pappa offers another explanation for one of the Tannaim.

R' Pappa's explanation is successfully challenged.

6) Wine offering

Shmuel describes the procedure for wine offerings.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

Numerous unsuccessful challenges to Shmuel's description are recorded. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

A wine offering extinguishing the flame of the Altar

והא קא מכבי? כיבוי במקצת לא שמייה כיבוי

Shmuel taught, based upon a verse (Bamidbar 15:10), that one may offer a donation of wine by itself for the Altar, and when he does so the wine is sprinkled upon the fire of the pyre. Although there is a prohibition against extinguishing the fire of the Altar (Vayikra 6:6), Shmuel holds that partial extinguishing is not prohibited. In this situation, the few drops of wine only extinguish part of the flame as they hit, so it is not prohibited.

Tiferes Yisroel clarifies the question of the Gemara. We have a rule that when someone is confronted with a task that is a positive mitzvah, and at the same time entails the violation of a prohibition, the rule is that the positive command overrides the prohibition - עשה דוחה לא תעשה. The classic example of this is the mitzvah of yibbum, where marrying one's sister-in-law overrides the sin of marrying a brother's ex-wife. Here, too, notwithstanding the sin to extinguish the flame of the Altar, the person is fulfilling the mitzvah of bringing his offering of wine. Why, then, should the Gemara be concerned about the violation of putting out the flame of the Altar?

This issue is not problematic according to Rava who holds (97b) that the rule of a positive mitzvah overriding a negative commandment does not apply in the Mikdash. However, Rav Ashi holds that this rule does apply even in the Mikdash.

Tiferes Yaakov explains that extinguishing the flame of the Altar comprises two mitzvos. One is a negative command not to extinguish the flame (לא תכבה). Perhaps this issue alone could have been overridden with the positive command to bring a wine offering. Yet, there is an additional positive mitzvah in that same verse (Vayikra 6:6), "The

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the Gemara's conclusion regarding the question of what comes first; תדיר or מקודש?
2. What is the nature of oil distributed in the courtyard?
3. What is the procedure for an oil offering?
4. What is the procedure for a wine offering?

HALACHAH Highlight

Should one interrupt **יעלה ויבוא** to recite **רצה**?

תדיר ושאינו תדיר וקדים ושחט לשאינו תדיר וכו'

If one has a frequent korban and an infrequent korban and he slaughtered the infrequent korban etc.

One time when Rosh Chodesh coincided with Shabbos a person began **יעלה ויבוא** before reciting **רצה** in Birkas HaMazon. Normally **רצה** is recited first since **רצה** occurs more frequently than **יעלה ויבוא** but the question that arose was whether he should interrupt in the middle of **יעלה ויבוא** in order to be able to say **רצה** or not. Sha'agas Aryeh¹ relates that the Gemara inquires about a person who had two korbanos to offer, one frequent and the other not frequent and mistakenly he slaughtered the infrequent korban first. Should he continue to offer the korban that is not frequent or should he interrupt the service of the infrequent korban and offer the korban that is more frequent? Sha'agas Aryeh proves that the conclusion of the Gemara is that he should finish offering the infrequent korban before offering the korban that is more frequent. Seemingly the rationale behind the Gemara's conclusion is that once a person began performing a mitzvah it is not proper for him to interrupt that mitzvah. Similarly, although **רצה** should precede **יעלה ויבוא**, nevertheless, once he began **יעלה ויבוא** he should not interrupt to say **רצה**.

Sha'agas Aryeh proceeds to explain that the correct basis of the Gemara's uncertainty was that once the infrequent korban was slaughtered the time for that mitzvah has arrived whereas the time for the frequent korban has not yet arrived since the animal is still alive. Accordingly, in our case since the obligations for both recitations have arrived, it could be argued

(Insight...continued from page 1)

eternal fire shall remain lit on the Altar." This positive command cannot be dismissed in order to fulfill another mitzvah of sprinkling wine on the fire, except for the fact that partial extinguishing is not prohibited.

The Gemara offers an alternative answer and says that although even partial extinguishing may be prohibited, here it is allowed because it is being done for the sake of a mitzvah. Or Sameach (to Hilchos T'midim U'Musafin 2:6) understands that this answer is using the aforementioned rule that a positive commandment can override a prohibition. Although we noted that the extinguishing of the flame of the Altar comprises two mitzvos, one positive and one negative, this rule is appropriate here, as he explains. The positive commandment of extinguishing the flame is not being violated until the entire fire is being put out. Here, where the drops of wine only douse a bit of the flame, the positive commandment is not an issue. Now that we assume that partial dousing is in violation of the negative commandment, the Gemara acknowledges that the rule of a positive command overriding a negative command can be implemented. ■

that one should interrupt **יעלה ויבוא** in order to say **רצה** which is more frequent. Teshuvos Divrei Malkiel², however, cites Rashi³ who explains that the inquiry of the Gemara revolved around the question of whether it is disrespectful to interrupt an infrequent mitzvah once one has begun that mitzvah as Sha'agas Aryeh initially explained. Since the conclusion of the Gemara is that one should not interrupt, the same halacha will apply in our case and one should not interrupt in order to recite **רצה** first. ■

1. שו"ת שאגת אריה סי' כ'.

2. שו"ת דברי מלכאל ח"א סי' י'.

3. רש"י ד"ה אבל לא. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Perpetual Offering

"תדיר ושאינו תדיר תדיר קודם..."

On today's daf we find that what is brought more often has precedence over what is brought less frequently. One example of what is brought with more frequency is the korban tamid.

Rav Yisrael Salanter, zt"l, would say, "Not only is one who learns every free moment of the day considered a masmid. One who learns every single day even if it is not all day long is also con-

sidered a masmid. The proof of this is from the korban tamid. It is called olas tamid, a perpetual offering, even though it is only brought twice a day."¹

Rav Yisrael added, "This is also the greatness of one who learns halachos every day and is guaranteed a portion in the world to come. One may well wonder about the advantage of this promise. After all, isn't every Jew filled with mitzvos like a pomegranate? And we also find that every Jew is guaranteed a portion in the world to come, so what is the exceptional advantage granted to one who learns halachah every day?

"Although this is all true, one who

spends a set time every day learning halachah has extra merit. People are rightfully afraid that they will lose part of their portion in the world to come for one reason or another. Learning halachah every day insures that Torah will not be forgotten. One who engages in this every day is rewarded middah k'neged middah, by protection from the hardships of this world. Just as he caused the Torah to have more continuity, his Torah is also afforded continuity in this world, and his reward in the next world is not touched."² ■

1. תנועת המוסר, ח"א, ע' 279

2. תורת רבי ישראל מסלנט, ע' 159-158

Daf Digest is published by the Chicago Center for Torah and Chesed, under the leadership of HaRav Yehoshua Eichenstein, shlit"i

HaRav Pinchas Eichenstein, Nasi; HaRav Zalmen L. Eichenstein, Rov; Rabbi Tzvi Bider, Executive Director, edited by Rabbi Ben-Zion Rand.

Daf Yomi Digest has been made possible through the generosity of Mr. & Mrs. Dennis Ruben.